

"Fear not: for, behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

NO. 9

Taking it for granted that the book of Daniel was originally placed in the third section of the Sacred Canon, we would not prove it to be a spurious work. But had the Jews placed it in the third section, and by so doing in some way detract from the merit of the book, and tend to its being expunged altogether, methinks the Jews of later times would gladly have grasped at this opportunity to throw overboard what has been such a thorn in the flesh side, with respect to the advent of Christ. For it is Daniel who so solemnly prophesies the birth of our dear Saviour.



the Messiah; and these same prophecies were just as exactly fulfilled, as could be shown did space permit. Since the expiration of the time specified by Daniel, the Jews have been and still are, utterly at a loss how to account for the non-appearance of their long expected Messiah. In fact, so eager have they been to rid Christians of so powerful a weapon as the book of Daniel has proved in controversy with them, that they have corrupted the Septuagint version, and also a version by Theodotion, and the old Septuagint has been lost; so that now it is a difficult matter to reproduce its original.

But to return. Josephus in his *Treatise against Apion*, Book I Article 8, enumerates the books of the Sacred Canon as follows:—Five books of Moses, thirteen Prophetic books, and four containing hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life. So that down to this time (A.D. 38 to 97) Daniel was placed in the second or prophetic section, for no one would assert that it was a book of hymns, or precepts for the conduct of human life; therefore it could not at this (Josephus') time, be reckoned in the 3rd section; and had it been originally placed in the third section; the Jews, as I have shown would never have transferred it to the prophetic section afterwards, and certainly not, after the time of Christ.

This, then, is conclusive that the book of Daniel was originally placed in the second or prophetic portion of the Sacred Canon, which Canon was fixed fully 400 years B. C.

We now come to the closing proposition: That Daniel of the Captivity, HIMSELF wrote the book of prophecies bearing his name.

In all the discussions respecting the authenticity of this book, it has never been doubted that Daniel was a historic person and did really live in the years B. C. 606 to 533. This, I say, has always been allowed as a well grounded fact. My task then, is not to prove that Daniel was a real person; but to show that he did really write the book, and not some other person under the assumed name of Daniel.

It is noticeable in reading the book, that the author (whoever he may be) intended the book to be understood as the work of one man, and not a compilation by two or more. True, Daniel is spoken of in the third person until chapter vii. 15, where the author, speaking of the vision of the four beasts, suddenly breaks out, "I, Daniel, was grieved in my spirit;" also in chap. viii. 1, we find a similar style, "a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel;" and again in chap. x. 2, "In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks;" and the 7th verse. "And I Daniel alone saw the vision." Again, chap. xii. 5 we read—"Then I Daniel looked. These passages are as strong a proof of the identity of Daniel as the author, as can be desired; short of a declaration duly signed and attested.

This, then, is perfectly clear, that the writer of the book intended that it should be understood to be the work of one man, and the name of the author (whether real or assumed) Daniel.

It is noticeable also, that the Jews accepted it as the work of one man: even Daniel of the Captivity, and also that he ranked very high in their estimation as a prophet; for Josephus says of him (Ant. b. x. ch. 11), "He was so happy as to have strange revelations made to him, and those as to one of the greatest of the prophets; inasmuch that while he was alive, he had the esteem and applause both of kings and of the multitude, and now he is dead he retains a remembrance that will never fail. For the several books that he wrote and left behind him are still read by us till this time, and from them we believe that he conversed with God; for he not only told of future events, as did the other prophets, but he also determined the time of their accomplishment. And while prophets used to foretell misfortunes and on that account were disagreeable both to the kings and the multitude, Daniel was to them a prophet of good things, and this to such a degree, that by the agreeable nature of his predictions, he procured the good will of all men; and by the accomplishment of them he procured the belief of their truth, and the opinion of a sort of divinity for himself among the multitude. He also wrote and left behind him what evinced the accuracy and the undeniable veracity of his pre-

dictions.

From this eulogium, it could scarcely be imagined that the Jews thought so little of the book of Daniel as not to rank it with the prophetic books. In fact the very opposite would be expected, from the estimation in which he was held at the time of Josephus.

We find also that other and sacred writers ascribed the book to Daniel of the captivity. Ezekiel, who was contemporary with Daniel, twice mentions him: first in chap. xiv. 14, where he places him side by side with Moses and Noah—conclusive evidence that he was held in very high estimation even in his own lifetime. Secondly, in chap. xxviii. 3, where speaking to the prince of Tyre, he says, "Behold thou art wiser than Daniel."

In 1 Macc. chap. ii. 60, Mattathias when on his death-bed, in exhorting his sons to be zealous for the law, and calling to their remembrance the acts their fathers had done in their time, speaks thus of Daniel: "Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouths of lions."

Coming to the New Testament, we find Christ in Matt. xxiv. 15, speaking very definitely of Daniel as the author; the words are these: "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place (who so readeth, let him understand):"

Paul also evidently refers to Daniel, when writing to the Hebrews, chap. xi. 33; he says, "Who through faith . . . stopped the mouths of lions."

Since then, the Jews as we have seen, from the time of Ezekiel, who was contemporary with Daniel, down to the time of Joseph (A.D. 33 to 96) accepted the book of Daniel, as the production of Daniel of the Captivity, and as such placed it in the Sacred Canon along with the other prophetic books, and zealously guarded them from all extractions or additions; I ask, what room for objections to them is left to us, living all these ages afterwards?

True! the originals of the books written by the sacred historians, are lost, and none of their writings can be verified in that way. But are not the originals of very recent works lost? and yet their authenticity is never questioned. Take for instance, Shakespeare, of whose works not one original can be found; in fact, the only writings of his that have been preserved, are three signatures to legal documents. Yet the plays and poems are accepted without doubt, as the work of Shakespeare.

Why is this distinction made respecting the works of different men? Simply because the one claims to be inspired and attributes his work to God; the other writes as an ordinary man, claiming no particular authority for his work. The one being inspired commands the attention and obedience the Almighty requires from all His creatures; this claim of God upon His creatures, the doubter rejects, and thinking to clear himself from all that binds him to God and eternity, he throws overboard the word of God, with such excuses as in the book under consideration.

My readers, do not, I beg of you, be led away by the notion that a denial of the Word of God frees you from all responsibilities connected with disobedience to it. To doubt a thing to be true, and then deny its existence does not destroy the fact. It still remains to stare you in the face at every turn, and demands your acceptance of it,—your belief in it.

I have now shown that the Sacred Canon was completed and closed in the time of Ezra about B.C. 400, and that nothing has been added to or taken away since. That the book of Daniel was not written in the time of the Macabees, about B.C. 164. That it was translated into Greek, along with the other books of the Old Testament, at least 280 years B.C. That it was not originally placed in the third section or Hagiographa, but in the second, with the other prophetic books, and that Daniel of the Babylonish captivity, himself wrote the book, between the years 606 and 533 B.C.

In conclusion, let us one and all apply the test given by Christ, when he said, "They are the scriptures which testify of me,"—and finding that the books of both Old and New Testaments do testify of Him, let us not be found denying them.—*Glad Tidings*.

Book notices and cash receipts crowded out.

### The Spirit in Man.—Concluded.

Although, as we have shown, man possesses many different spirits, we have not been able to find any warrant in Scripture to lead us to conclude that mankind possesses a spirit that can exist in an organized state separate from the body called "man." We nowhere read in the Bible, that the "spirit in man" is immortal. We do not find the word "immortal" or any of its synonyms connected with either "soul" or "spirit," in the Bible, notwithstanding the fact that the clergy so frequently use the terms "immortal spirit," "never-dying soul," and the like. On the contrary we find connected with the word "spirit" as follows:—"Remember, I beseech Thee, that thou hast made me as the clay; and wilt thou bring ME to judgment?"

Thou hast granted me life and favour, and Thy visitation hath preserved my spirit." From the book of Job we not only learn that "there is a spirit in man" (32:8) but in the above language from the same book, we learn that the "spirit" is something that is perishable, for Job states that God had preserved his spirit. "Although God had made Job as clay and was able to bring him to dust again (see Gen. 3:19), yet God had by his visitation preserved Job's spirit (breath, or life). Or as Ezekiel puts it, God had "in love to" his "soul delivered it from the pit of corruption" (see Isa. 38:17). Job is in harmony with Paul, for as we have seen, he also teaches that the spirit, as well as soul and body, is subject to preservation.—1 Thess. 5:23: "Such being the case, it cannot be true that any of these (spirit, soul and body) can be immortal, or of a nature not subject to death. But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; \* \* \* and the fowls of the air, and they shall teach thee; and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee. \* \* \* Who knoweth not in all these, that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this? In whose hand is the soul (life) of every living thing (animals as well as mankind) and the breath (spirit, ruach) of all mankind."—Job 32:7-10. The Psalmist says, "With thee (God) is the fountain of life."—Ps. 36:9. It is quite necessary, then, that we, being mortal creatures, should pray God to preserve our whole person, spirit, soul and body. We should also, at death, commit our spirit (breath or life) to the keeping of God, that we may "obtain a better resurrection" (Psa. 31:5; Luke 33:46; Acts 7:59; Heb. 11:35), at which event we shall receive from our Lord the spirit or life again. If worthy we shall be given everlasting possession of life or spirit.

See Luke 20:35, 36; Acts 13:46; John 3:13-16; 5:28, 29; 6:39, 40, 54; Mark 10:28-30; 1 John 2:25; Luke 12:28-30; Isa. 42:5; Rom. 8:10, 11. Another proof that the spirit is not immortal is found in 1 Cor. 5:5; and reads as follows: "Deliver such an one (see verses 1 and 2) unto Satan (the adversary) for the destruction of the flesh; that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." Why should Paul speak as if the spirit would perish "in the day of the Lord Jesus," if it is immortal? If the spirit is immortal, it is, consequently, incorruptible, and therefore could not perish in the day of the Lord Jesus. The person referred to by Paul, in the above passage, was sowing to the flesh, and consequently would "of the flesh reap corruption" (Gal. 6:8; Rom. 8:12, 13); "but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the Spirit (God) reap life everlasting."—Gal. 6:8; Rom. 8:12, 13. Paul apparently believed that if a wicked person was delivered to the adversary he would be punished according to the law of the land, and would then be likely to reform, and his flesh or fleshy propensities would then be destroyed, and the result would be that his spirit (life) would be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

We also read of the spirit being corrupt as well as faint. Job says, "My breath is corrupt. For 'breath' in this passage the margin reads 'spirit.'" "Every spirit shall faint."—Ezek. 21:7. We would not expect an immortal entity to be either corrupt or faint. Mortals are frequently in these conditions, but immortal beings, as far as the Bible reveals, are perfect and full of life at all times, consequently we judge that the spirit in man is not immortal, no matter how strenuously the clergy may assert the contrary.

Immortality is a thing we do not now possess, it is evident, for we "reap life everlasting." How could Paul say, "He that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting," if the spirit, which the clergy tell us is the real man, is immortal? How could we gather a thing we already have in our hands? How could we reap life everlasting if we already possessed it? Paul teaches in Rom. 2:7, that we are to "seek for glory, honor and immortality" by a patient continuance in well doing. Why "seek for" the thing we already possess?

Christ taught the same truth when he said, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."—John 3:14-16. Would this language not be nonsense if we were immortal spirits, as the teachers in the popular churches tell us? But "let God be true," even if we make "every man a liar."—Rom. 3:4. Christ again says, "I give unto them (his followers) eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand."—John 10:28.

"Thou (God) hast given Him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given Him."—17:2. See also John 6:25-29; 4:14. If we already possess immortality, how could Christ, as shown in these passages, give us eternal life? The idea is absurd. The Bible throughout pointedly teaches eternal life to be a conditional gift; something we do not now possess, but a thing we can "inherit."—Matt. 19:29. It is a boon that believers in the first century hoped for because it was not in their possession, but was a matter of promise by God, as the following passage shows: "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before times eternal." (R.V.) Being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.—Titus 1:2; and 3:7. If the spirit is the man, and is immortal, why "hope for eternal life?" Evidently the doctrine of the immortality of the spirit or soul is not a scriptural doctrine.

Paul exhorts the "man of God to fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life."—1 Tim. 6:12. What nonsense it would be for Paul to persuade his brethren to lay hold on something they had a good hold of already! Evidently Paul did not believe the spirit in man to be an immortal entity. No, he did not, for he said, "The King of kings and Lord of lords \* \* \* only hath immortality."—1 Tim. 6:15, 16. If the King of kings and Lord of lords only hath immortality, how can every man, woman and child have it? The word immortality occurs only five times in the whole Bible. We have now noticed two of the occurrences in this article, the remaining three are found in the following connections:

Jesus Christ \* \* \* hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."—2 Tim. 1:10. "For this corruptible (body) must put on incorruption, and this mortal (body) must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."—1 Cor. 15:53, 54. The first of these passages shows that life and immortality was brought to light by Jesus Christ through the gospel. But the gospel nowhere shows that any of mankind possess immortality now. The gospel simply brings it to light as a thing we may have on certain conditions; the second quotation, with its connections, shows that "mortal man" (Job 4:17), may put on immortality at the resurrection; that it is something mortal that is clothed with immortality. These passages also go to show that we are not now in possession of immortality. The word "immortal" occurs but once in the Bible and is applied to God.—see 1 Tim. 1:17.

We do not receive immortality before birth, or at birth, but at the resurrection, in the world to come. Proof.—Luke 20:35, 36; 1 John 5:19; 6:40, 54; Luke 12:30; Mark 10:28-30; Dan. 12:2; 1 John 2:25; Psa. 17:15. If at these passages show, we do not get immortality until we are raised from the dead, in the age to come, it is impossible we can have it in this life, in the shape of an immortal soul or spirit. If the spirit, who told the first lie, said, we shall not surely die, that is no reason why we should believe we are immortal, and thereby make God a liar. Although mankind do not now possess an immortal life or spirit, it is good news to perishing humanity that

they may attain to it. The passages referred to below show how we can attain to it.—Mark 16:15, 16; John 6:40; Gal. 6:8; 2 Tim. 2:8; John 12:25; Jude 21; Rev. 22:3, 5; 1 Peter 1:3, 4; 2 Peter 1:4.

We have treated our subject briefly, but trust we have said enough to give strangers to the truth an incentive to search the matter more thoroughly for themselves in the Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."—1 Tim. 3:15.

We now leave the matter with our readers, hoping that, at last, they and the writer may be found worthy of immortality when Christ, who is our life, shall appear.—EDITOR.

### 'Great is your Reward in Heaven'

Matt. 5: 12

These words are supposed by many to teach the idea that souls, which are said, by the same man, to be immortal, go when the body dies, to heaven, to dwell and be rewarded. Those who try to make our text teach this, "do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God."

Do we not read in the same chapter, "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the EARTH" (verse 5)? The meek are those who rejoice and are exceedingly glad when they are persecuted for Christ's sake (ver. 11, 12). This is the class whose reward is great in heaven, as will be seen by reading Matt. 5:3 to 12, inclusive. If the language of our text teaches, as is claimed by the clergy, that people go to heaven, how can we reconcile that theory with the Scriptures which say "the righteous hall never be removed" (from the earth, obviously)—Prov. 10:30. "For evil doers shall be cut off (be destroyed)—Mal. 4:3-5; Psa. 37:20, 34; but those that wait upon the Lord shall inherit the EARTH." For yet a little while, and the wicked shall NOT BE; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. But the meek shall inherit THE EARTH; and delight themselves in the abundance of peace.—Psa. 37:9, 11, 22.

It is evident from the reading of these passages that the inheritance of the earth by the righteous is to be at a time when the wicked shall not inherit the land. It cannot be a temporary inheritance, for in the same chapter we read, "The Lord knoweth the days of the upright; and their inheritance shall be for ever."—ver. 18. The righteous shall inherit the LAND and dwell therein FOR EVER.—see ver. 29, also ver. 34. All the promises made by God to the righteous, of all ages, were connected with the earth. On the contrary, no one has ever, at any time, been promised heaven. God promised the land of Canaan to Abraham, the father of the faithful, for an EVERLASTING possession—not a temporal possession.—Heb. 11:8, 9; Gen. 12:1-3; 13:14; 17:15; 18:18; 22:17; Ex. 6:3, 4; Rom. 4:13. The spiritual seed of Abraham are joint heirs of the land—not heaven.—Gal. 3:8, 24-29; 6:26-29; 28, 34; 2 Sam. 23:1-5; 7:12-14; Psa. 132:11. Other portions of Scripture bearing upon this point read as follows:

"The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it. But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it."—Prov. 2:21, 22. "The heaven even the heavens is the Lord's; but the earth hath he given to the children of men."—Psa. 115:16. "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven (heaven's kingdom) but the children (or those inhabiting the territory) of the kingdom shall be cast out."—Matt. 8:11, 12. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and all yourselves (i.e., the inhabitants of the territory, to be occupied by the saints) thrust out. And they (the saints) shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the Kingdom of God."—Luke 13:28, 29. That the Kingdom of God is to be on the earth instead of in heaven is plainly to be seen from Daniel, chapters 2 and 7.

The saints sing "a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign ON THE EARTH."—Rev. 5:9, 10. If the righteous are to "remain" in the land, how can they go to heaven to receive their reward? If the kingdom of God, which is to be inherited by Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the prophets, and all the



the saints, (east, west, north and south is in heaven), how can wicked people be cast out of it and on that account weep, wail and gnash their teeth, seeing that no wicked people are in heaven?

We must conclude, then, from the evidence contained in the passages quoted, and from the fact that Jesus when about to go to heaven "to receive for himself a kingdom and [then to] return," said to his disciples, "Where I go ye cannot come," that "the heaven, even the heavens, is the Lord's; but the earth hath he given (by promise) to the children of men." Heaven, it is evident, is exclusively God's dwelling place, and apparently none others are allowed there but his only begotten Son and his angelic servants.

But Jesus says to his followers, "I will come again to (earth) and receive you unto myself, that where I am you may be also." This shows that the Saviour receives his followers on earth, instead of heaven. Where he is there they will be also. Will he be in heaven again, after coming back to the earth to receive his disciples? No; for he shall, according to promise, "sit upon the throne of his father David and reign over the house of Jacob (the Jews) FOREVER." And how long shall this Kingdom last? "Of his Kingdom there shall be no end."—Luke 1:30-33; Dan. 2:44; 7:13, 14, 18, 22, 27. Jesus now sits on God's throne.—Rev. 3:21. But he has promised those who overcome that he will grant them to sit with him on his throne (or have power and authority with him) "even," he says, "as I also overcome, and am sit down with my Father in his throne."—Rev. 3:21.

Verily, I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration (when is that?) when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging (or ruling) the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall inherit everlasting life."—Matt. 10:28, 29.

From these Scripture quotations, it is evident that David's throne, which is to be occupied by Jesus forever, is to be the throne of his glory; for if he sits on his father David's throne, for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end, he cannot therefore sit on any other throne. Now, David's throne, all must admit, was on earth, and in Jerusalem, Palestine, or the land of Canaan, that land which was promised Abraham and his seed (Christ) and all those in him by faith.—Gal. 3:16, 24-29. As the time of the fulfillment of the promises to the righteous are so closely connected with the reign of Christ on the throne of his glory, it is of great interest to know when he shall sit in the throne of his glory. We have the answer to this momentous question by Christ himself, in Matt. 25:31, as follows: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." This precludes the idea that Jesus is now sitting upon the throne of his glory, or will do so before he comes to this earth again.

"But," say you, "what has all this to do with the words of Christ, composing the caption to this article?" Simply this: What we have quoted from the Scriptures shows plainly that the words referred to cannot be understood in the popular sense, that is, that they teach that good people go to heaven at death to be rewarded. Proverbs 11:31 confutes this error emphatically, which reads as follows: "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner. Now, cannot the reader see that, notwithstanding the fact that our reward may be great in heaven, nevertheless we may receive it in the earth without the necessity of any one but Christ going to heaven. And this is just what our Lord teaches in the many passages we have quoted, and emphatically so in this one: "Behold I come quickly (suddenly), and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be."—Rev. 22:12. According to this no man gets his reward until Jesus comes to earth again; He is then clothed with power and authority to distribute rewards to his followers according to their merits. This power and authority are given him by his heavenly Father. We understand, then, that our "treasure," or reward, is in

the keeping of the Giver of all good until the time arrives for the Son of man to sit upon the throne of his glory. "At the judgment the King shall say to those on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you (prospectively) from the foundation of the world."—Matt. 25:34.

The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which go iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then (not before) shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."—Matt. 13:41-43. The fact that Jesus brings our reward with him from heaven, shows that it is in store there for us, and also shows that we do not go there to receive it. In harmony with this is what Paul says to Timothy, as follows: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure (dissolution) is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day (the day of Christ's appearing); and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."—Tim. 4:8. From this it is evident that Paul did not expect to go to heaven to get his crown, but, on the contrary, it was to be laid up in store for him and all those who love the appearing of Christ on this earth again, in which day they will receive their crowns. For "the Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom."—Tim. 4:1. So let us, like Paul and all the Christians in his day, "look for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ: who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. These things speak and exhort."—Titus 2:13-15. "Lay up treasure for yourselves in heaven."

\* For where your treasure is there will your heart be also."—Matt. 6:20, 21. "Set your affection on things above, not on things on earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God (who art in heaven). When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then (not before) shall ye also appear with him in glory."—Col. 3:1-4.

#### A Few Questions Answered.

Who are those that have no hope and are without God in the world?

ANSWER.—All who are "strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." (Eph. 2:11, 12.)

What are the covenants of promise? ANS.—"In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates. \* \* And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in three generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an EVERLASTING possession; and I will be their God." \* \* and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Gen. 15:18, and 17:7, 8, and 22:17, 18, and Heb. 11:8-16.

"Be ye mindful always of his covenant; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations, even the covenant which he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac, and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance." 1 Chron. 16:15-18.

Also the covenant with David.—2 Sam. 7:8-19. "Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the KINGDOM over Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons (Christ and all who are in Christ—Jesus and his brethren) by a covenant." 2 Chron. 12:5-8. "Then will I establish the throne of thy kingdom, according as I have covenanted with David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man to be ruler in Israel." 2 Chron. 7:18. He hath made me (David) an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure: for this is *all my salvation, and all my desire.*" 2 Sam. 23:5.

Are not the covenants of the promised land and kingdom, what is called the Gospel? ANS.—"The Scripture foretelling that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before, the GOSPEL unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." Gal. 3:8. "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the GOSPEL of the kingdom of God, and saying the time is fulfilled, and God's Royal Majesty, or God's Anointed King has approached, repent ye and believe the Gospel." Mark 1:14.

Who is this seed of Abraham and of David, that is to have that promised land for an everlasting inheritance, and "possess the gate of his enemies," (that is, conquer and rule them)? ANS.—"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to thy seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed which is CHRIST." Gal. 3:16.

What then is Christ's rule or kingdom, the kingdom of God which he hath given to David and his sons by a covenant? ANS.—"The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his KINGDOM there shall be no end." Luke 1:32, 33.

How is it that the gospel of Christ—that is, the glad tidings of this kingdom—is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth? ANS.—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved—observing all things whatsoever I (Christ) have commanded." Matt. 28:19, and Mark 16:16.

How must this gospel or glad tidings be received or believed in order to be saved by it? ANS.—"Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Mark 10:15.

How is it that the Saviour, the king of this kingdom, says, "Many I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able?" Luke 13:24. ANS.—It is because they do not seek aright. They do not "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," and seek it as a little child. Matt. 6:33. It is because they do not find the way—"because straight is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Matt. 7:14.

What is this righteousness of God, this narrow way of righteousness that a person must seek for, in order to get into the kingdom? ANS.—"For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matt. 5:20. It must be "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe." (Rom. 3:22-26) that is, faith in Christ by believing his gospel—"the glad tidings of the kingdom"—(Luke 9:1) and being baptized into the saving name for the remission of sins—justification or righteousness.

What if a person does not believe this only gospel of Christ? ANS.—"He that believeth not shall be condemned."

Who of every Nation is accepted of God? ANS.—"In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Acts 10:35.

What is it to work righteousness? ANS.—It is to have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ (John 6:29) by believing his gospel and "observing all things whatsoever he has commanded"—doing what he says. Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Luke 6:46.

How is it that the many who are seeking to enter in and shall not be able, will say to the king "in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not taught in thy name, and done many wonderful works?" when he will say to them, I never knew you; depart from me ye that work iniquity," instead of working righteousness—instead of observing the things which I taught? ANS.—It is because their teaching will have been contradictory to the teaching and doctrines of the Saviour and the entire Scriptures. God has said by the prophet Isaiah, "This people (that is, the people who will say Lord, Lord, &c., for Isaiah was speaking prophetically) draw near me with their mouth, and their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear towards me, is taught by the precept of men." Isa. 29:13. And as Christ himself said, quoting Isaiah: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of

men. For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men. Ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition." Mark 7:6-9. They will say "Lord, Lord, have we not taught in thy name?" (see Diaglott) Yes, but the king will know that what they had held and taught, even though in his name, was their own tradition, instead of his, and his Father's words, viz: their tradition is that the righteous go to heaven when they die; but the word says they are asleep in Christ, to be raised at his coming and received unto himself. 1 Thess. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:16-22.

Their tradition is, that the kingdom is up in heaven "beyond the bounds of time and space," but the word says, it is to be on the earth, under the whole heaven, Dan. 7:27; Matt. 6:10.

Their tradition is, that man has an immortal soul, a term not once found in the Scriptures. But the word says, man (himself) became a living soul—"mortal man." Job 4:17; Gen. 2:7.

Their tradition is, that man has a never-dying soul. But the word says, the soul that sinneth shall die. Ezk. 18:4, 13.

Their tradition is, that the wages of sin is eternal life in misery or hell. But the word says, "the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23.

Their tradition is, that the wicked are to be punished with endless misery or torment. But the word says, they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction." "The second death." 2 Thess. 1:9; Rev. 21:8.

Their tradition is, that the dead know more than when alive. But the word says, "the dead know not any thing." Eccl. 9:5.

Their tradition is, that the righteous dead are alive up in heaven. But the word says, they "shall be made alive at his (Christ's) coming." 1 Cor. 15:23.

Their tradition is, that he that getteth religion and continueth faithful shall be saved. But the word says, "he that believeth the gospel and is baptized shall be saved."

Their tradition is, that it is necessary to believe in the Trinity; not once found in the scriptures. But the word says, "there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things." 1 Cor. 8:6. One God, and one only begotten Son of God.

The tradition is, that their Christian's hope is the hope of going to heaven at death. But the word says it is "the hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers"—the one "hope set before us" in the one gospel, and called "the hope of the gospel," Col. 1:23; Acts 26:6; Heb. 6:13-18, L. C. THOMAS.

#### Possessed with Devils.

##### CHAPTER II.

I proceed to solve the several objections which have been urged against the foregoing explication of the Gospel demoniacs. That the persons spoken of in the New Testament as demoniacs were really such, many have attempted to prove: 1st. From what was said and done by the demoniacs themselves. 2nd. From the destruction of the herd of swine, which the demons are said to have entered, and stimulated to an instantaneous madness. And 3rd. From the expressions used by our Saviour in performing, and his disciples in recording, the cure of demoniacs. Under these three heads may be comprised all the objections, drawn from the New Testament, against the doctrine advanced in the preceding chapter.

##### SECTION I.

From what was said and done by the demoniacs themselves some have concluded that they were inspired and assisted by superior agents, such as demons are commonly supposed to be. It must, however, be allowed (what seems to furnish a presumptive argument against this opinion) that the New Testament never represents the language and behaviour of the demoniacs, as the evidence of a supernatural agency. We are only therefore to examine whether such agency can be justly and certainly inferred from the facts themselves.

I.—It is pleaded that the demoniacs knew and proclaimed Jesus to be Messiah. The man with an unclean spirit, in the synagogue at Capernaum, said, "What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? I know thee who

thou art, the Holy One of God" (Luke iv. 34). The demoniac in the country of the Gergesenes called him "the Son of God" (Matt. viii. 29). And we are told that demons (demoniacs) cried out and said, "Thou art Christ (the Messiah), the Son of God" (Luke iv. 41).

The general expectation of the coming of the Messiah at that time, the testimony borne to Jesus by his illustrious forerunner, and the numerous miracles more especially performed by Jesus himself, at the commencement of his public ministry, rendered him the object of universal attention, propagated his fame throughout all Judea and the countries bordering upon it (Matt. iv. 23, 24) and created in the Jewish people a strong persuasion that he was the Messiah, some of these reputed demoniacs were only subject to epileptic fits (Luke iv. 33) and consequently might enjoy the use of their understandings, like other men, when those fits were not upon them. The other demoniacs were madmen, of whom the Jews give this account: One while they are mad, another while they are well; while they are mad they are to be esteemed as madmen in respect of all their actions; while they are well, they are to be esteemed as being their own men in respect. Few are so little acquainted with persons of this sort as not to know that very frequently their disorder is not only temporary, but partial, not affecting their understandings, naturally quick, except perhaps on a single subject and leaving them on all others in the full possession of themselves.

Now, might not demoniacs, long before they were seized with their disorder, learn in common with others, the high character of the Messiah, then universally expected? And in their intervals of sanity, so very common to persons of a disordered understanding might they not hear of the fame of Jesus as the expected Messiah, which was spread in all places before they made any acknowledgement of his character? It is indeed scarce possible that they could be ignorant of him, because in general they were under no confinement. One of those whose testimony to Christ is particularly mentioned above, was in the synagogue, a place of public worship. With respect to another, who was in the country of the Gergesenes, it cannot seem extraordinary that he should be acquainted with the character and fame of Jesus, if we consider that Christ had heretofore preached upon the borders of his country, and been followed by crowds from it, who would not fail to publish the miraculous cures which Christ performed, either upon themselves or upon others in their presence, amongst whom many were demoniacs (Matt. iv. 24, 25). We are to consider farther, that, violent as the man's disorder was at certain seasons, he had intervals of sanity at certain periods, as is clearly implied in its being said the spirit had oftentimes caught him (Luke viii. 27), for if his disorder often returned, it must have often left him.

If I might be allowed to propose a conjecture, I would observe that perhaps the demoniacs would run into the common opinion concerning Jesus as the promised Messiah more eagerly than persons of a cooler judgment; the latter being struck with some contrary appearances in his character (such as the poverty of his condition, and the spiritual nature of his doctrine), which escaped the attention of the former, who, for this reason, with greater confidence saluted him under his high character, agreeably to the first impression which his miracles made on the minds of all men. This seems to me much more probable than that infernal spirits should freely and zealously assert the divine claims, and spread the glory of Jesus as the Messiah.

The foregoing observations are, in a great measure, applicable to the case of the Pythoness at Philippi who for several days together followed Paul and crying out, "These men are the servants of the Most High God, which shew unto us the way of salvation" (Acts xvi. 17). Though she laboured under a melancholy, or some species of insanity, she might be informed, either by attending the preaching of St. Paul, or by conversing with others, what the apostle and his companions professed themselves to be. The strong impression which this information made upon her mind, will easily account for this woman's conduct in following them from day to day in the manner here related, especially if



we add that, under a melancholy, the mind is always fixed on one object. The honourable testimony she bore to Paul could not be the effect of the spirit of Python or Apollo; because it tended to disparage himself and the whole tribe of heathen deities. If you say it was the devil who bore this testimony to Paul, you will find it more difficult still to account for this zeal for truth in the father of lies; because this testimony, as it would appear to proceed from one of their own gods, would have great weight with the Gentiles. Nor was any evil spirit constrained to bear this testimony to Paul; for the apostle was grieved at it, and in order to put a stop to it, cured her disorder (Acts xvi. 18). This brings us to examine another objection against our idea of possessions.

II.—It is urged that Christ commanded the devils (*dæmons*) not to discover him. This objection properly belongs to the third general argument in favour of real possessions, and is introduced here only on account of its near affinity to the preceding article.

In order to solve this difficulty it will be necessary to recollect the idea which the ancients entertained concerning demoniae. It hath been observed already, that the demons within them were supposed to occupy the seat of the human soul, and to form all its functions in the body. During his possession, the demoniac himself was silent; it was the demon alone that spoke in him. Whatever was done by the former was attributed to the impulse of the latter. Demoniacs were not only regarded by others, but generally conceived of themselves, as speaking and acting under the influence of the spirits by which they believed themselves possessed, or as being those very spirits. At least, everything they said and did corresponded to their apprehensions of the sentiments and inclinations of the indwelling demons, being themselves indeed (in their own imagination) nothing more than their organs of speech and actions. Hence the demons and the demoniacs were often, in common speech confounded together; both were described under the same term, and the same act was referred indifferently to either. St. Chrysostom, in the passages cited from him above, at one time represents the *dæmons* as saying they were the soul of such a monk; though at another time he ascribes this to the *demoniacs*. Instances of same manner of speaking are to be found in the Gospel. St. Mark, on one occasion, says (Mark ii. 11) "*Unclean spirits, when they saw Jesus, fell down before him and cried; saying, Thou art the son of God.*" On another occasion (Mark v. 6, 7) similar to this, the same evangelist represents, not the unclean spirit, but the man supposed to be possessed by him, as *seeing Jesus, worshipping him (or falling down before him)* (Luke viii. 28) and crying "*What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God?*" In the sequel of the history of this demoniac, we are told by St. Mark (v. 10) that he "*besought Jesus much that he would not send them away out of the country.*" By St. Luke (viii. 31) in the parallel passage, it is said the demons *besought him, that he would not command them to go out into the deep*. The request to enter the swine is, by three evangelists, referred to the demons (Matt. viii. 31, Mark v. 12, Luke viii. 32). On all these occasions the demoniacs were the only persons who spoke to Jesus; of them alone it is true that they saw him and fell down before him. Nevertheless, demoniacs having been anciently considered as the mere organs of evil spirits, it was no uncommon thing to ascribe to the latter what was said and done by the former. The evangelists, we have seen, adopted this phraseology, and referred to demons the acts of demoniacs; and therefore, when they tell us "that Jesus suffered not the *dæmons* to say that they knew him to be the Messiah," they are to be understood, of the men possessed by them. Those are the persons who published Christ's character; and on this account might be enjoined silence. If you still contend that it was not to the person possessed but the spirit supposed to be within him, that Christ addressed this injunction; yet it must have been designed to have its effect upon the former, rather than upon the latter, who was most effectually silenced by being ejected. In reality, it is a matter of little moment whether the restraint was laid on the demoniacs or not; for if Christ, in mere conformity to the accustomed modes of speech (as

will be shewn below in the third section) commanded demons to *come out*; he might, upon the same principle, command them to *be silent*. Nor was anything more likely to awe the demoniac himself into immediate silence, than his hearing such a command delivered to the spirits that (in his opinion) actuated him, by one so famed as Jesus was for the power of controlling them. The language was adapted to his apprehensions, and the disturbed state of his mind; and if Christ saw fit to speak to him at all in that state, was it not proper to speak according to his conceptions, and in the manner most likely to be attended with success? Indeed, if Christ had addressed the demoniac, he would nevertheless have been considered as speaking to the demon, as appears from the following fact:—When Jesus asked a possessed person, *What is thy name?* the man, conceiving of himself as an evil spirit, or as being merely the origin of evil spirits, regarded the question as proposed to them, and, under this impression, replied, *My name is legion*.

Christ forbade his own immediate disciples to declare him openly to be the Messiah (leaving men to collect it at leisure from the evidence that was set before them) that he might not draw after him an immense crowd of worldly minded Jews, who mistaking the nature of his kingdom, were disposed, and had once attempted, to take him by force and make him a king. Persons of such a temper were not prepared to receive the spiritual doctrines of the Gospel; and their following Christ in large crowds, in order to advance him to the throne of David, must have given umbrage to the Roman government, or at least afforded the Jewish rulers, filled with envy and hatred against him, an opportunity of accusing him of sedition and treason. Now, the same prohibition which Christ gave to his own disciples (and also to many others), it was equally proper to give to the demoniacs, whose confident persuasion of his being the Messiah, and warm gratitude to him for the benefit of his miraculous cure, would prompt them to proclaim their exalted opinion of him.

If Christ had any peculiar reason for checking the zeal of the demoniacs, it probably was the desire of leaving no room for the specious pretence that there was a secret agreement between him and those evil spirits, who were judged to be so eager in applauding him. Christ's refusal of (what was deemed to be) their testimony, is a full proof that they were not constrained by God to bear it, and at the same time serves to condemn the conduct of those impostors that afterward swarmed in the Christian church, who laid so great a stress upon the pretended *confession made by demons*, and even claimed a power of *extorting* it against their inclination and interest. The frequent and confident appeal to these confessions, which the Father makes, do them no credit, and were without doubt received with contempt by men of understanding: for if demons are wicked and lying spirits, as they are generally supposed to be, they are much more likely to speak falsehood than truth.

III.—Some have said that demoniacs could not be mere madmen, because they argue with Christ in a very rational manner, and speak to better purpose than the bulk of those that were in their senses.

This assertion being chiefly founded upon the behaviour of the Gadarene demoniac, let us inquire how far it agrees with the superstition of his being directed and assisted by superior intelligences in all that he said and did. 1. *When the demoniac saw Jesus afar off, he ran to meet him.* Was not this conduct absurd on the common hypothesis? The unclean spirit dreaded nothing as much as being expelled and tormented by Jesus, and yet hastens into his immediate presence, instead of flying from it. 2. *In the next place, the demoniac fell down before Jesus, and worshipped him.* Did the devil, under whose influence he is supposed to act, hope, by his external homage, to deceive the Son of God into a good opinion of him, or to bend him to a compliance with his proposals? 3. *When Christ said, What is thy name?* how ridiculous is the answer, in case it was returned by the unclean spirit: *My name is legion; for we are many!* Suppose that is a large army, either a private soldier, or the officer from all the other soldiers and officers in the army?

IV. More absurd still was the beha-

viour of the devil (if he was the demon here spoken of), when Christ ordered him to *come out of the man*, of whom he had taken possession. One moment he disclaims the authority of Jesus, and resents his undertaking to eject him.

*What have I to do with thee, thou Son of the Most High God?* The very next instant he acknowledges his power over him, and entreats him not to exert it: *I beseech thee, I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not.* Immediately after he upbraids and reproaches him, and at the same time appears to expect some effects of his displeasure: *Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?* He hath recourse again to supplication, and beseeches Christ, that he might not be sent away out of the country, nor commanded to go out into the deep. To the devil, we are told, the whole world is but one place. Why then doth he dread a temporary banishment from so small a spot as the country of Gadara? Why is he so uneasy at being cast out of one man, if he hath the power of entering another? Why doth he fear being sent into the deep or abyss? Whatever idea he had of this place, he deprecates an evil he had not been threatened with, and which, had it been threatened, he could not hope to avert by his intercession, especially if he had asked, as some suppose he did, for leave to continue in that country, only for the sake of opposing Christ? What is still more extraordinary, while under a dread of Christ, as his judge and avenger, who could have remanded him to the abyss for his past crimes, he asks for leave to do further mischief; and to enter into a large herd of swine; desirous, it is pretended, to bring an odium upon Jesus, as the author of the mischief. Could the devil expect such a request to be granted? Lastly, when he had procured for himself and his associates the quarters he desired, why did he, by destroying the swine, lay himself and the legion under the necessity of seeking new ones, which, he acknowledges were not to be had in that country without the consent of our Saviour? Nay, he seems to have asked leave to enter the swine with a further view, viz., to prevent his being sent immediately to the place of punishment. How absurd then was it to wilfully expose himself to the evil he deprecated, by drowning the whole herd? Would you, if you were in your senses, pull down your house in which you wished and were allowed to live, if you knew that whenever it was destroyed, you should for some past crime be confined in a dreadful dungeon and suffer upon the rack? On the whole, I am not able to discern in any part of the demoniac's behaviour the signs of extraordinary sagacity, such as mark the agency of a spirit of celestial origin and therefore can see no reason to believe that any such spirit made use of the organs of man to carry on a conversation with Jesus.

On the contrary the behaviour of the demoniac, from the view we have already taken of it, appears to be that of a madman agreeably to the express representation of him in history. Nor is any one circumstance mentioned concerning him inconsistent with this representation. Here it should be observed that it was a common opinion amongst the Jews, if not amongst all the people of the East, in the belief of which the Gadarene demoniac must have been educated, that the punishment of the spirits of wicked men would not be completed till the judgment day. It must have been observed farther, that Jesus had been long famed for expelling demons, and thereby exercising an absolute power over them. Nor is there any reason to suppose that this demoniac was a stranger to fame in this respect; for though considerable time had elapsed since his first seizure with madness, yet his disorder only returned at certain seasons, with intervals of sanity between them. Everyone knows that madmen are often distinguished by the quickness and acuteness of their natural parts. Their lucid intervals sometimes lasts for a considerable time, and in some cases a single moment makes a vast alteration. Even under their disorder, they sometimes say things surprisingly just, far more so than anything said by the Gadarene demoniac. They reason rightly from wrong principles, and appear both raving and sober at the same time, especially on different subjects. We must add that the unhappy man, strongly tainted with the common opinion about possessions, fancied himself really possessed; nay, sometimes (as was usual

in such cases) personated the demon by whom he thought himself inspired, and spoke as if he was himself that very demon. Now, his conduct is the natural result of the principles and impressions here explained, and of a disordered understanding.

Perceiving at a distance the company, at the head of which was Jesus, the demoniac, then in the height of his disorder, ran to them, as he was wont to do to all passengers, whom he was eager to assault: for we are told that he was exceeding fierce so that no man might pass that way. Our Lord observing his approach, said, *Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit* (Mark v. 8, Luke viii. 29). This language is by two evangelists expressly assigned as the reason of the demoniac's address to Christ, and consequently prior to it; hence the demoniac concluded that the person who addressed him was the same who was so famed all over Judea for his power over demons, and he worshipped, or fell down before him, acknowledging him to be the Son of God. It is observable that some space of time intervened between the command of Christ and the cure of the demoniac though on other occasions his commands were instantly obeyed. Here the execution of it was suspended, and a conversation carried on with the demoniac, to give the spectators, who were strangers to him, an opportunity of deliberately observing his visage and behaviour (which manifested the great disorder of his mind), as well as to prepare the way for the event that immediately succeeded the cure of the demoniac. No sooner, however, did Christ say, *Come out, thou unclean spirit*, than the demoniac was awed and checked, as it was necessary he should, to prevent his doing mischief to the company. But, instead of rejoicing in the hope of deliverance from his present misery, and being thankful to Jesus for the favor designed him, he conceives himself injured, is displeased and remonstrates: *What have I to do with thee, thou Son of the Most High God?* Believing himself to be an evil demon, or that he was actuated by a demon, speaking in and by him, he feels a dread of Christ's power; and, in the name of the demon, or his own he beseeches and adjures Christ not to torment him. He pleads with him that the time for the punishment of wicked spirits was not yet come; and seemingly upbraids him with an intention of inflicting that punishment before the time. Then dropping the thought of the day of judgment, he expects some marks of displeasure immediately, what he could not tell, whether being banished from that country, or drowned in the sea, or sent to the abyss. Our Saviour to give the spectators a still farther opportunity of observing the height of his distraction, as well as for the other reason just now mentioned, continued the conversation, and asked him *What is thy name?* He answered, like a madman, who thought himself possessed with a multitude of demons, or that he was one of the number, *My name is legion; for we are many*, more than six thousand. He could not know that he was possessed by a single demon, much less that he was possessed by a vast multitude of demons; but he spoke what his disorder suggested; and either fancied himself to be a legion of demons, or to be actuated by a legion. He confounds himself with those spirits under whose influence he supposed himself to speak and act. Just at this instant, as his eyes wandered, he discerned at some distance a herd of swine; and, agreeably to the false apprehensions he had of himself, said, *If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine.* A strange request for an imbecile being, a pure spirit, and one of celestial origin, to make! but not at all unsuitable to the character of a madman, that fancied himself to be, or that spoke in the name of an unclean spirit, who next to tombs defiled by the bodies of dead men, could find out no habitation more unclean, or more conformable to his ideas of himself, than the body of swine.

Were it possible to find out a rational meaning for everything said by the demoniac, even this would not prove that he spoke by the suggestion of the devil; for madmen sometimes say things surprisingly just, which is far from being the case with this demoniac, whose whole conduct seems to me to correspond precisely to that of a mere madman, under those impressions which he had received from education,

and the information he gained in the intervals of his sanity. But the truth is, that the interpreters, to support a favorite hypothesis, ascribe to him sense and sagacity more than human, though the history itself will warrant us to pronounce him disordered in his understanding; and they force a rational construction upon the very circumstances which seem to have been mentioned by the evangelists with no other view than to illustrate his insanity.

V. It hath been alleged, that demoniacs discovered more human strength. This allegation is chiefly supported by the case of the demoniac under the foregoing article, who had been often bound with chains and fetters, and had as often broke them.

The ancients, perhaps, were less skillful than the moderns in the methods of confining such unhappy persons; and who is ignorant that mere madmen discover very amazing strength from an extraordinary flow of animal spirits, or from some other cause, especially in the most violent paroxysms of their disorder? But so great is the force of prejudice, as to make the plainest symptoms of a natural disease proofs of the interposition of superior beings.

I cannot conclude this section without taking notice of the case of the demoniac at Ephesus, who is thought to have given proofs both of power and knowledge more than human. To the Jewish exorcists, who took upon them to call over those that had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, the evil spirit (that is, the man who was supposed to be possessed by him) said, *Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?* The historian adds, *And the man in whom the evil spirit was, left upon them and overcame them* (Acts xix. 10-17). Before this event, St. Paul, for the space of two years had cured all sorts of diseases, and ejected demons in the name of Jesus, at Ephesus: how then could this demoniac be ignorant either of Jesus or Paul? Moreover, the demoniac finding that certain Jewish impostors vainly pretended to the power of expelling demons, and fancying himself to be a demon, or possessed by one, his indignation and rage (accelerating the motion of the blood and spirits), supplied him with new strength, and he assaulted and vanquished the exorcists, who were not prepared to make a defence, and were disgraced and dispirited by the public detection of their imposture. The disappointment and disgrace of these magicians served to vindicate the credit of St. Paul's miracles, to create a high reverence of Jesus, in conformation of whose divine authority they were performed, and to deter others from profaning his sacred name, by using it only as a charm.

The more carefully I examine the language and behaviour of the New Testament demoniacs, the more difficult doth it appear to me to draw from them a proof of the reality of demoniacal possessions. I cannot discover in them clear and certain marks of the interposition of any superior agents, much less of infernal spirits, who certainly could have no great zeal to assert the honour of their enemy and avenger. In a word, if you will ascribe the conduct of the demoniacs to the agency of demons, you must allow that the latter acted out of character, and were as mad as the demoniacs themselves could be.

\* It is very astonishing to find writers of sound judgment on other matters, inferring from this answer of the demoniac, or (as they suppose) of the devil, that the madman was really possessed by a great multitude, if not exactly by a legion of devils. Is any credit due to the father of lies? Can there be a better reason for disbelieving anything, than his affirming it to be true? Could Christ design to bring mankind to give him credit, and to receive doctrines upon his testimony? If one demon alone can, as it is supposed he can, deprive a man of his sight and speech and hearing, and of his reason too, and do all this in a moment, why should a legion of demons be employed, and lose that time which they might have spent in doing mischief elsewhere?

† Hence it appears that if this demoniac was assisted by a supernatural power, this assistance must have proceeded from God, not from the evil spirit who could have no other aim than to lessen the credit both of our Saviour and his apostle. Nor could a display of the power of the demon on this occasion produce any other effect than creating a suspicion in the people, that Jesus and Paul were confederates with himself. If with this malicious view, he was willing to bear testimony to Christ, what occasion was there for him than to compel to bear it by God? and would God favour his malicious views? The occurrence related seems to have been providentially designed to bring disgrace upon the Jewish exorcists, and thereby to answer the purposes mentioned above.

(To be Continued.)



"Fear not: for, behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

BELLEVILLE, ONT., 1888

NO. 10

Subscriptions must be paid strictly in advance.

One copy for a year, or twelve numbers,	\$1 00
Six " " " " " "	5 00

Any one wishing to make donations for the extended circulation of the paper can do so, and the money will be faithfully applied to that purpose.

We do not wish it understood that we endorse every *expression* that may be used in articles clipped from other publications. The same will apply to articles written by others for this paper.

## What Kings?

BY ZENAS B. CHASE.

of God. Just see how little of their wealth, and of their time, and of their talents, and of influence, professors followers of the Lamb of God give to honor and glory of a kingdom which is not of this world. Whenever Christians shall give themselves wholly to the work of God and shall make all they have entirely tributary to the will of God, may they expect "a perpetual Pentecost" and thorough and permanent reproduction of apostolic Christianity. "If judgment begins at the house of God, what shall the end be of them who obey not the gospel of the Son of God?"

In the second chapter of Daniel we have a clear description given of a certain number of kingdoms to precede the kingdom of God. These are four in number, and are familiar to almost every school boy. They are described as an "Image" of a human form in four consecutive metallic parts. This Image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his sides of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay." If he had no guide but human authority would be very difficult to determine at events fill this Prophecy, but this very chapter gives a clear description of the four successive empires to precede the kingdom of God, Babylon the first in the list, Nebuchadnezzar standing for representative head or father of the universal empires with Media-Perเซีย and Rome which exactly fills his bill. In the 7th of Daniel we have clearly described four ferocious beasts to symbolize the same events. These Beasts are described as, first like a Lion, second like a Bear, third like a Leopard, fourth "a dreadful terrible and strong exceedingly." This beast has ten horns, and another little Horn" which waxes exceeding great, and in the days of these kings (at Kings?) the God of heaven will set up a kingdom. Dan. ii: 44. are told by modern writers and by all commentators that these 10 kings were to kingdoms into which the Roman government was divided.

this position is taken as granted without a moment's reflection. But the Prophecy says "kings" not kingdoms. Now what are the facts in the case. Rome was never governed by "a king" and then his kingdom divided into kingdoms as claimed? The senate form of government commenced with its early settlers about 164 B. C. and it was 150 years before Rome swallowed up the whole of the three former empires. Rome was afterward governed by the "Caesars." For the dates of their rise go to the New Testament. Now follow a blank until the "time of the end," a period yet future and all is plain. No Roman king or kings has ever filled the bill. In fact Rome was never divided into kingdoms as claimed. Rome has had a hundred subordinate kings. What of it? They have no place in prophecy, neither does the "papacy," in fact there is no Roman kingdom now existing, much less 10 confederate kingdoms. Then what becomes of so much human speculation on this subject? It is not my purpose to controvert the thousand conflicting theories on this prophecy, but point out a few plain facts. If it were true that the ten divisions took place so long ago then we should have a *deformed* "image," for his "toes" would be out of proportion with the body; what a strange looking sight a six foot man would be with "toes" ten or twenty-five feet in length? God is more consistent than all this.

Turn to Rev. xiii. and here we see a consolidated beast of the four beasts of Daniel made into one. Take notice, this beast has all the constituent parts of Daniel's four, the leopard, the bear, the lion. He also has the seven heads and the ten horns all specific. We are told by commentators in general that this beast is the symbol of Rome, or the papacy. I would with the same propriety say it was a symbol of America.

erican slavery. The *time* and *place* these symbols are to occupy is all we want. Those who hold that the "Litt'l Horn" of Daniel vii. and viii. symbolizes the "papacy" ought to have learned in 40 years' experience and over that they were on a "wild goose chase" before this date; some twenty years was sufficient for me. The ten horns (or kings) have not yet arose, hence the eleventh horn or king is yet future. If you will not consider this fact, then go to the full length of your chain; but it is my ardent desire that you will not bring up a confirmed infidel, for such teaching is fast swelling their ranks.

That vast territory with its seeming millions must be broken to pieces by a terrible period of wars, famines and plagues, as brought to view under the opening of the seven seals, trumpets, and vials of wrath, as brought to view in Revelation vi. and onward. This is what we may properly call "the judgment stone period" of seven years on the four empires of prophecy now consolidated as before mentioned into one (see Rev. xiii). This will be the equivalent of a reconstructed image, to what length human audacity has extended. The image was some 600 years in formation from head to foot, from east to west. This is exactly the way writers on prophecy have disposed of the symbol. Only the feet and legs remaining for the last stroke of the stone, when the facts are it is the *first* stroke instead of the last, and the head of Gold-Babylon, comes last. Such writers give a complete reversal of the order of events from those of prophecy. Ought not such teachers to be first taught themselves. The image must be reconstructed for the "judgment-stone" to smite it *first* on the iron section (Western and central Europe) then section by section; brass next (Turkey) and so on until it reaches the golden head the great commercial emporium of the east—Babylon, "and great Babylon comes in remembrance before God." Here ends the reign of Anti-Christ and the kingdom of God will be established. Amen.

[Although we give this article space, we cannot endorse it as a whole; especially the idea that the image of Neuchadnezzar's dream is to be reconstructed].—EDITOR.

Dr. Parkhurst, a distinguished Hebrew and Greek lexicographer, says: "The Hebrew word *nephesh* is a noun, and is supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul. I must confess for myself, that I cannot find a passage in the entire Bible where it has such a meaning.

Dr. McCulloch says: "There is no word in the Hebrew language that signifies either *soul* or *spirit*, in the technical sense in which we use the terms as applying to something distinct from the body."

"Since the introduction of the Chaldean philosophy, the Jews were persuaded of the pre-existence, transmigration, and immortality of souls." (See Gibbon, vol. iv. pages. 499, 491.) This shows plainly that there was a time when the Jews did not believe in any thing of the kind.

Lactantius says: "Man stands erect and looks upward, because immortality is offered him, though it comes not unless given by God. For there would be no difference between the just and the unjust, if every person that is born were made immortal; immortality, therefore, is not a law of our nature, but the wages and reward of virtue."

Bishop Tillotson says: "The immortality of the soul is supposed, or taken for granted, rather than revealed in the Bible.

Archbishop Whatley says. "No such doctrine as the immortality of the soul is revealed in the Word of God."

David Brown, D. D., Professor of Theology in Aberdeem, Scotland, says: Nowhere in the Bible is the immortality of the soul, distinct from the body, taught—a notion which many erroneously have derived from heathen philosophers."

Dr. Benisch, a celebrated Jewish doctor, in a recent lecture, says the "doctrine of the immortality of the soul was first introduced among the Jews by the Sanhedrim, consequently they could not always have believed in such a doctrine." *Selected.*

## SECTION II. (a.)

A farther argument in favor of real possessions is taken from the destruction of the herd of swine, which the demonsiacs are said to have entered, and stimulated to instantaneous madness. This case is considered by some as a decisive proof of the power of demons both over the human and brutal race, and is thought even to have been purposely designed by Providence to convince us of this principle, and to refute the opposite opinion.

To enervate this argument, Dr. Sykes suggested, and Dr. Lardner strenuously contended, that the swine were frightened by the two madmen, and driven down the precipice into the sea. On the other hand, the advocates of the common hypothesis insist upon it (and to my apprehension, with great reason) that it was impossible for two men, however fierce, to put so vast a herd of swine as two thousand into motion in an instant, and to cause them all to rush with violence down a precipice into the sea; swine, contrary to the nature of most other animals, running different ways when they are driven. But this part of the controversy might well be spared; it not appearing from the history that the men ever fell upon the herd, or made an attempt to drive them into the sea. Nay, the history expressly refers their destruction to a different cause from the behaviour of madmen.

To understand the true state of the case, which doth not seem to have been attended to by the writers on either side of the question, we must recollect that those persons who were anciently thought to be possessed were disordered in their understandings. These two possession and madness, were imagined to bear to each other the relation of *cause and effect*, and accordingly to commence and cease together. When devils were supposed to *enter* and

creature, immediately he grew mad when they departed, his disorder was removed. The evidence of their entrance was madness, and a composed behaviour was the evidence of their departure. And therefore, when it is said, in the case now under consideration, that the demons *went out* of the madmen and *entered* the swine, the evangelists, if you interpret their language agreeably to the popular opinion on which it was founded, must mean that the madmen, in consequence of the departure of the demons, were cured and restored to their right mind\*; and that the swine, in consequence of the demons entering them, were infected with rage and madness; the cure of the former, and the madness of the latter, being the very ground upon which was concluded that the demons had quitted the one and taken possession of the other. The evangelists must farther mean by this language, that the men were cured before the swine were disordered; otherwise they would not have spoken of the demons as passing out of the former into the latter; *When they came out of the men, they entered the herd of swine.*

It appears likewise from the history that at the time the demons were cured, they were present with Christ, and the herd of swine at *some distance from them* (Matt. viii. 30). Nevertheless, no sooner was leave asked for the demons to enter the herd, than it was granted: *Forthwith, or immediately, Jesus gave them leave, and said unto them, Go! Then went the demons out of the men, and entered into the herd of swine.* The demons, therefore, were cured upon the spot, while the swine continued feeding quietly by themselves; and consequently they had no opportunity of falling upon them, or forcing them down a precipice into the sea. Further, the men, at this time, could have no *disposition* to make any

such attempt upon the herd; for we have seen, that before the latter grew mad, or appeared under any disorder, the former were restored to their right mind, or, in other words, the demons had *left* the men before they took possession of the swine. The men, therefore, if the words of the evangelists are to be our guide, neither drove, nor attempted to drive, the herd into the sea. Had the spectators seen them engaged in such a mad and mischievous attempt they would not have thought the demons had left them, but considered them still as possessed madmen. The history, it is certain, doth expressly ascribe the destruction of the swine, not to their being *driven* by the *demoniacs*, but to the *entrance of demons* into them, or to their being seized with the same disorder from which the men were relieved, and which was thought to be caused by demons. The evangelists, even supposing them to have adopted the common hypothesis, would not have said, if the demons had entered the swine, if the latter had only been pursued by the demoniacs.

Nor can I see any room to dispute the testimony of the evangelists in this matter. For, whatever their opinion was with respect to the *cause* of these men's disorder, which was *secret and invisible*; all must allow, that they were capable judges of the *disorder itself*, of its *outward symptoms* and effects, which fell under the notice of their senses. They, and all who were present, thought they could not see the demons passing from the men into the swine, yet could not but see whether the men were cured of their madness, and the swine infected with the same disorder: they could not but see at what time these different events happened; whether the madmen, while they were still under the power of their disorder in the highest degree,

of their disorder in the highest degree, fell upon the swine with great violence, and so caused them to precipitate themselves into the sea, or whether after their cure, (evinced by the composure of their behaviour) and while they were at some distance from the herd, the swine grew mad, and, without any other reason for it, rushed with fury into the water. And therefore if we believe them to be faithful historians, we must give them credit when they declare the following obvious and sensible fact: that just after the men became composed, (or, in their own language, just after the demons left them) the swine became outrageous (if the demons entered them) and, to the astonishment of the spectators, rushed upon their own destruction. Behold the whole herd of swine, consisting of two thousand, *ran violently down a steep place into the sea.* The swineherds were of the same opinion with the evangelists with regard to the fact in question; for the absent Gadarenes who received their information from the swineherds, had no apprehension that the madmen were the cause of the destruction of the swine, but considered it as a divine judgment, for they were *seized with great fear, and prayed fearfully to depart out of their coasts, dreading* without doubt, some new calamity from the exertion of Christ's power. Nor did our Saviour contradict this opinion though he might, without opposing their prejudices concerning demons, have plainly told them, had that been the real truth, that the swine were frightened into the sea by the demoniacs, and thereby have removed their prejudices against himself. For these reasons, cannot accede to the opinion of those learned writers who ascribe the destruction of the swine to the madmen

Neither can I see any just ground for ascribing it to the agency of demons. We have before shown how groundless and how absurd it is, to attribute to human spirits such a power as possesses lions imply. The arguments urged above against the supposition of their entering the bodies of *men*, and stimulating them to madness, conclude with equal (or nearly equal) force against their having the like power over the *brute creation*. Reason and experience

\*This appears from Mark v. 15, Luke viii. 35, where the man is described as being in his *right mind* after the demons were departed from him.

A. Perpetual Pentecost.

In the Christian Leader under the above head we find the following practical thoughts :

There never will be "a perpetual Pentecost!" (and this we say emphatically to our own brethren in particular) until apostolic honesty, apostolic sincerity, apostolic zeal, apostolic self-denial and apostolic aggressiveness, with corresponding humility and simplicity of manners, are made the burden of our lives; not until there shall be more personal consecration, more subordination of the things of this life to the demands of the kingdom of God, and not until our wealth and our talents and our time shall be made absolutely tributary to the behest of the King immortal and invisible; not until there shall be exhibited far less pride, far less self-indulgence, far less of the vain pomp of this world; not until Christians shall "seek first (and last, and all the time) the kingdom of God and his righteousness;" not until Christians cease to seek after the high places in Caesar's kingdom, where they spend their means for popularity and human glory, and where to gratify false ambition, they spend their time and talents, thus making a Christian life secondary and subordinate to the great purposes



our only guides in the study of nature, loudly acclaim against this doctrine. If we suppose, (and we shall, in the next section, endeavour to prove that it is not a groundless supposition) that the evangelists, in reciting the case of the demoniacs, have only borrowed an accustomed mode of speech, without designing to give a sanction to the opinion on which it was at first founded; all that can be inferred from their saying, that the demons came out of the men and entered the herd of swine, is, that the madness of the former was transferred to the latter, in the same sense as the leprosy of Naaman was to cleave to Gehazi, and to his seed for ever. We allow what a learned writer contends for, that in the case before us, the power of imagination could have no place. It was never said, that the swine fancied themselves possessed; their disorder, I admit, was real, but not therefore demoniacal. So great a miracle as that wrought upon them can be ascribed to no other agency than that of God. Accordingly, we are told, that it was performed at the word or command of Christ. *Forthwith Jesus gave them (the demons, the reputed causes of madness) leave, and said unto them, Go.*

Should any inquire into the reasons of this divine dispensation, I might answer, that He who gave life to all hath a right to resume it, and doth often resume it, both from men and beasts, and visit their bodies with disorders, for reasons unsearchable by the human understanding; but many wise and important purposes are answered by the miraculous destruction of the swine.

1. It was a just punishment of the owners. For though Josephus calls Gadara (near which this miracle was wrought) a great city, and it was a part of the province of Syria; yet during the reign of Herod, it had belonged to Judea, on which country it bordered, and was no doubt in part inhabited by Jews, who probably owned the swine; for to that people Christ's personal ministry was confined, and on their territory he then stood. Now, the Jews were prohibited by the laws of Hyrcanus from keeping swine, and by the law of Moses from partaking of them as food. Their breach of the former naturally led to the violation of the latter. Our Lord, though he declined acting as a magistrate, yet, as a prophet, he might be commissioned by God to punish them either for this or any other crimes. And there was the greater propriety in his doing it for their offence, as they were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Jewish Sanhedrim, being under heathen government. The disposition they discovered upon this occasion in being more impressed with the loss of their substance than with the miracle wrought for their conviction, shows how well they deserved correction; as the miracle itself served to manifest Christ's own regard to the law of God.

## SECTION II (b).

2. The destruction of the swine served to ascertain the reality, and to spread the fame of the miracle performed upon the demoniacs. No miracle is more suspicious than the supposed expulsion of demons, abstracted from the cure of bodily disorders, there being much room left for collusion between the person imagined to be possessed and the exorcist. Frauds of this kind, both amongst the Jews and Gentiles, were common in that age; as they have also since been in a very scandalous degree amongst Christians. But it is self-evident, that a herd of swine could not be confederates in any fraud. Those who were strangers to the demoniacs (and such the attendants of Christ probably were) could not doubt of the reality of their disorder or its cure, when they saw it so wonderfully transferred to the swine. Hereby Christ established the credit, not only of the miracle performed on these, but upon all other demoniacs, for the conviction and benefit of mankind. That Christ's intention was benevolent, more especially towards the Gadarenes, is certain from his refusing to give the persons whom he cured leave to accompany him, and ordering them to acquaint their countrymen how great things God had done for them.

The loss of the swine would propagate the fame, as well as establish the reality of the miracle performed upon these demoniacs. The cure of a demoniac in this obscure part of the country, might have been little known or remembered, had it not been at-

tended with some extraordinary and affecting circumstances; such as would necessarily excite the attention of mankind, and naturally lead them to an inquiry into the character of Christ, and thus prepare them to receive the subsequent preaching of his apostles. Most highly beneficial to them was this miracle, if their temporal loss was the means of their gaining everlasting blessings.

3. The miracle performed upon the swine was calculated to correct the false notions concerning the power of demons, which were entertained in that age, as well by Jews as by Gentiles, by both of whom Gadara was inhabited. Very far were either of them from wanting (what some have supposed it was the express design of Christ on this occasion to give them) proofs of the great power of demons over mankind. The belief of their power was already too deeply rooted in the minds of men, and was the ground of much idolatry and superstition.

Let us examine then the nature of the miracle in question, and see whether it contains any proof of the power of demons. The outward and sensible effect, which was all that could be designed for the conviction of mankind, consists in transferring the disorder of the demoniacs to the swine; or rather in the swine becoming mad, immediately after the men were cured. Now, upon what ground do you affirm that this effect was produced by demons? If they had any concern in it, it was by soliciting the interposal of Christ; which looks like an acknowledgment of their own impotence. It took place at the command of Christ: to him therefore, and to that divine power by which he acted, it is most natural to refer it.

You allow that God was the author of the miracles performed upon the demoniacs. The history ascribed them to him in the most express terms, calling them great things which God had done for the demoniacs; not things which he permitted the devil to do for them. Now, the history will no more allow you to doubt of God's being the author of the disorder of the swine, than of the cure of the demoniacs; for, by the same sovereign word, Go, both these miracles were accomplished. You cannot therefore ascribe them to different causes. That the madness of the swine was not owing to a demoniacal agency, is farther evident from hence that their disorder terminated in their destruction; an event which it was the interest of the demons to use all possible means to prevent; because, according to (what is deemed) their own conceptions of things, it exposed them to some terrible punishment. Now, since it clearly appears that the madness of the swine was not owing to the agency of demons, is it not a natural inference from hence, that the madness of the demoniacs was not owing to that cause; that the request in particular made in the name of the demons to enter the herd of swine, and consequently all the other parts of their conversation with Christ did not proceed from a demoniacal influence? We shall hereafter have occasion to consider the language in which the evangelists describe the cure of the demoniacs, and the disorder of the swine; we only observe here, that the facts themselves are referred to God.

If the foregoing observations are just, the history before us does not exhibit a single instance of the power and interposition of demons; though here, where we have samples of the highest degrees of insanity, proofs of their agency were most to be expected. At the same time it represents God as the only being in the universe, who inflicts and removes diseases at his pleasure, not excepting those which superstition ascribed to evil spirits. On both these accounts this history, on which so much stress is laid by the advocates of real possessions, seems to discredit rather than confirm the extravagant notions which the Heathen, and (from them) the Jews, entertained of the miraculous power of demons.

4. This miracle prevented several great inconveniences that would otherwise have attended the ministry of Christ. As he was sent out to the Jews, so he never went out of their country, and seemed backward to work miracles for the benefit of the Gentiles, in order to avoid giving unreasonable offence to the Jews before the Gospel was offered to them in its brightest evidence. Now, the loss

which the Gadarenes sustained prevented both Jews and Gentiles in those parts from applying to Christ merely for the temporal benefit of his miracles, which was not their proper intention, and could not be dispensed to the Gentiles without increasing the prejudices of the Jews. At the same time, the behaviour of the Gadarenes, in treating Christ to depart out of their coasts, serves to show how ill-disposed they were at that time to receive the spiritual blessings of the Gospel; which is a further vindication of the conduct of Christ in declining all familiarity with them. With respect to the Jews, this miracle, which was performed during the most public part of Christ's ministry, and while his popularity was at its greatest height, was useful or necessary to strike an awe upon their minds, to prevent their raising tumults in his favor (as they were inclined to do), and their following him merely from worldly motives. The intention of this work in some degree corresponded to the miraculous punishment of Ananias and Sapphira, which created a mighty reverence of the Apostles, and prevented unbelievers from joining themselves to the Christian church, in order to share in its charitable donations (Acts v. 11, 13).

Lastly, though the Gospel, considered as a dispensation of mercy, was with great propriety confirmed chiefly by miracles of mercy; yet it was necessary there should be some examples of severity, to check the presumption of mankind in all ages, and to warn them of the danger of rejecting a divine prophet, who, though he eminent appeared as the messenger of God's love, was also appointed the minister of his justice.

Indeed, the destruction of the swine in so very extraordinary a manner, could scarce fail rousing the spectators of this miracle, and the numerous sufferers by it into thought and reflection, however lost they might be to more ingenuous motives. The fact was of such a nature as to alarm the attention of the very enemies of Christ, and to provoke their inquiry into the evidence of it; for it carried with it the face of inquiry and injustice towards the owners of the swine, and consequently furnished them with a seeming objection against Jesus. A strict inquiry must soon convince them of the fact; and the fact itself, when naturally reflected upon, pointed out its author, God, who hath a right to dispose of the lives of his creatures. The life of the swine was of no importance compared with the conviction and spiritual instruction of mankind: the great object which Christ had in view.

The most popular argument in favor of real possession is drawn from the language of Christ and his apostles, in performing and recording the cure of demoniacs, or in describing the case of these unhappy persons.

The sacred historians, it is alleged, affirm that they brought to Jesus those that were possessed with demons, and in like manner that to the apostles they brought them that were vexed with unclean spirits. St. Luke describes the damsel at Philippi by saying that she was possessed with a spirit of divination (Python or Apollo). Demoniacs, it is further urged, are distinguished from the diseased: They brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with demons. Possessions are mentioned as distinct cases even from lunatics. The demons, it is said, knew Jesus to be the Messiah, and were forbidden to proclaim Him under that character. In performing cures upon the demoniacs, Jesus rebuked the demons, and commanded them to come out. St. Paul said to the spirit of Apollo, I command thee in the name of Christ to come out of her (the damsel at Philippi). And he came out of her the same hour. In the case of the epileptic youth, Christ charged the foul spirit to come out of him, and to enter no more into him.—Mark ix. 25. The cure of demoniacs is described by the expulsion or departure of the demon or demons, by which they were said to be possessed. If I by the finger of God cast out demons.—Matt. xii. 28; Luke xi. 20. The demon came out of him and hurt him not.—Luke iv. 35. Unclean spirits crying out with a loud voice, came out of many that were possessed.—Acts viii. 7. The demons came out and went into the herd of swine.—Matt. viii. 32. Out of Mary Magdalene went seven demons.—Luke viii. 2; compare Mark

xvi. 9. The ejection of demons, or cure of demoniacs, is distinguished from the healing of diseases: Jesus cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits.—Luke vii. 21. Behold I (says Christ) I cast out demons and I do cures.—Luke xiii. 32. The evangelical history affirms: Jesus cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick.—Matt. viii. 16. He gave the Twelve power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of diseases.—Matt. x. 1, 8. Accordingly they cast out many demons and healed the sick.—Matt. vi. 13. When the seventy, with great exultation, said to their Lord, Even the demons are subject to us through thy name, Jesus, with a seeming reference to this event, replied, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven. He adds, Behold I give you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you. Notwithstanding in this rejoiner, that the spirits are subject unto you.—Luke x. 17, 20. That I may not omit anything on which the advocates for real possessions lay any stress, I add that they farther plead that there are passages in the New Testament where demons cannot denote diseases of any kind. St. Mark calls the Gadarene demoniac, him that had the legion.—Mark v. 15. And our Lord represents the unclean spirits, as taking to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself.—Luke xi. 26. Now, how, we are asked, can one man have a legion of diseases? or, can one disease, with deliberation and design, take along with it seven others of a more grievous kind than itself?

From the several foregoing passages of the New Testament, it has been inferred that both Christ and his apostles entertained and countenanced the doctrine of real possessions. And if it were an error, "the inspired teachers of the Gospel," we are told, "must needs be free from an error so fatally affecting the religion they were entrusted to propagate, and ought therefore rather to have rectified that error than knowingly confirmed the people in it."

In order to answer this objection, it is not necessary to endeavour (as some have done) to explain away the language of the New Testament concerning demoniacs, or to force an unnatural construction upon it. However possible it may be, by great learning and ingenuity, to strain some of the passages cited above into a different meaning, yet, whoever candidly considers them all must allow, at least, I freely allow, that both our Saviour and his apostles made use of the common and popular language of the age and country in which they lived on the subject before us, and that this language was originally founded on the supposition of the reality of demoniacal possessions. But the question still to be decided is, whether merely by using this language, they gave their sanction to the opinion to which it owes its rise.

We have already seen that neither Christ nor his apostles first introduced into the world the doctrine of possessions or the language that expressed it. If they are liable to censure, therefore, it is only for not departing from the accustomed modes of speaking on this subject, for not forming a new language concerning it. We have likewise seen that they never assert the doctrine of possession, but on the contrary entirely subvert it, when they were immediately commissioned and instructed to teach the world. They contradict themselves, therefore, if by using the common language with respect to demoniacs they meant to countenance the opinion on which it was first grounded. This alone might satisfy us, that they did not, and could not, design to give their sanction to that opinion. Nevertheless, great stress being laid by many on the argument in favor of possessions, drawn from the language of the New Testament concerning them, I will offer some farther observations upon this subject, by which, I hope, it will appear, to impartial persons, that merely from the manner in which they speak of reputed demoniacs, it cannot be inferred that they intended to assert the reality of demoniacal possession.

1. It is customary with all sorts of persons, with the sacred writers in particular, and our Saviour Himself, to speak on many subjects in the language of the vulgar, though known and admitted to have been originally grounded on a false philosophy. This obser-

vation hath been often made and well illustrated by others, but is too important to be here omitted.

We call a certain distemper lunacy, without enquiring what influence the moon hath in causing or increasing it; nay, though we should believe, as many do, that the moon hath no influence upon it. In like manner we still speak of St. Anthony's fire and of St. Vitus's dance, without acknowledging the power or existence of the saints. When we complain of the hag or nightmare, which is the name of a real disorder, resembling the pressure of some weight upon the breast, imputed to a hag or incubus, do we not follow custom without approving the hypothesis? Philosophers speak of the motion and path of the sun, though they know it never changes its place; they say that it is in the spring, in the constellation of the Ram (where it was in the time of Hipparchus, upwards of two thousand years ago), notwithstanding their allowing that the constellations have all changed the places assigned them by the ancient astronomers; and that now the sun is in the spring in that part of the heavens where the constellation of the Bull is situated. So difficult is it to recede from those ways of speaking which were introduced by the ancients, even after the reason of them ceases. They are retained, notwithstanding their acknowledged impropriety. Our best philosophers still use the common language concerning the rising and setting of the sun, though they know it is founded on error and prejudice. They call that an eclipse of the sun, which they are very sensible, is properly an eclipse of the earth.

The prophets of God, also, as well as the professors of science, when they speak upon points of philosophy, adopt the common language, though grounded upon opinions universally allowed to be erroneous. Our Saviour says, "God maketh his sun to rise," and the Psalmist represents this luminary, which is fixed in the centre of our system, as running a race.—Ps. xix. 5, 6. When we read, in Scripture, that the sun knoweth his going down, and that God laid the foundations of the earth, we know that the expressions are popular only, and far from being agreeable to true philosophy. Calvin makes the same observation on that passage of the Psalmist: He hath founded it (the earth or the world) upon the seas, and established it upon the floods. Nor are these the only instances that may be mentioned. The dew was thought by the ancients always to descend from the sky, and the language of Scripture corresponds to this opinion, for it is called the dew of heaven, and represented as falling on the ground, as dropping from the clouds and the heavens; nevertheless, it hath been proved by plain experiments that dew will ascend from the earth and the plants. The manna, with which the Israelites were fed in the wilderness, though attended with several miraculous circumstances, doth not appear to have been of a different nature from our modern manna, which is only an exudation from plants and trees. But as manna was still late thought like the dew, to fall from above, the Scripture says, When the dew fell in the night, the manna fell upon it. So that even in relating miracles the sacred writers make use of popular expressions, on whatever hypothesis they were built. In illustrating their doctrine, also, their expressions are accommodated to the general apprehensions of men and appearances of things. Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, says our Saviour, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit. St. Paul, likewise, uses similar language: That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. Strictly speaking, the seed of the corn sown, which is the entire future fruit, and is a minute insensible principle contained within the outward grain, doth not die. When this is killed by an accident, it never rises. Nevertheless, the outward part or the body of the grain is corrupted and dissolved in the earth, and this corruption or death (as it is called) of the outward part of grain is necessary to make way for the production of the new corn from the seminal principle within. In this view only is it true that the seed dies, in order to it being quickened, and bringing forth fruit. And this served to illustrate the respective arguments of our Saviour and St. Paul. Other examples might be added.



But those already produced are sufficient to show that the prophets of God make frequent use of the vulgar phraseology, though originally grounded on a mistaken hypothesis. Nor do they hereby countenance that hypothesis, or make themselves at all answerable for its truth or falsehood, any more than the naturalists do whenever he adopts vulgar expressions, and says, the dew falls, the sun rises, sets, or is eclipsed. The most accurate authors, it is universally known, do not in either of their writings or ordinary conversation always speak according to strict philosophical truth. Now, if there are some undeniable instances in physics, in which the prophets of God, without incurring any kind of blame, employ the common language, though built on a false opinion, this may be the case in other instances. Nay, this most probably, is the case universally, when they speak on subjects of natural knowledge. It doth not appear that they did on any occasion frame a new language in order to express themselves in perfect conformity to true philosophy. Why, then, might they not adopt the common language with respect to possession, considered as the cause of a bodily disorder? Why should it be taken for granted that they express themselves with a philosophical exactness on this subject when they neglect it on others? You can no more infer their belief of possession from their saying that some bad demons, or a spirit of Apollo, than you can learn a man's system of philosophy from his saying that his friend hath St. Anthony's fire, or from his affirming that the sun rises and sets every day.

## THE GOOD NEWS.

BELLEVILLE, ONT., 1888.

We have received from Mrs. Carrie Williams, her book, containing 140 pages, entitled "The Heir of all Things. Whose Son is He? Why Did He Die? What Did His Death Accomplish?" The above from the title page indicates the character of the work, which is written in her usual off-hand style and is well worth perusal. Price 25 cents to be had from the authoress, San Diego, California.

Some time ago we received from Bro. L. C. Thomas, Dover, Delaware, a pamphlet of 48 pages, entitled "The House of Many Mansions." This is a work that should be in the hands of all who are anxious to know the truth about the good things of the gospel. In this treatise the author not only gives a good exposition of the text from which he takes the title of his pamphlet, but also shows in connection with that subject the Bible view of the gospel and its connection with the kingdom of God; which he shows to be on the earth, the inheritance of the saints. It is just the thing for general circulation. Price 15 cents, to be had of the author.

Some months ago, Joseph Bland, 7 Coventry Street, Kidderminster, England, sent us a pamphlet containing his lecture entitled "The Land Question: Its Ultimate Settlement; or Human Aims and Divine Intentions."

We read it to our little church here last Sunday (Jan., 29th, '88), and it was so well appreciated that the brethren concluded to order at once several copies for general circulation. The land question in Ireland is the basis of the lecture, and the author shows from a Bible standpoint how the difficulty will be solved in connection with the Kingdom of God. Price 5 cents. Brother Bland has also published others lectures entitled the Keys of Hell; Living Again; The Soul; What is it? also "The resurrection of Christ, and its bearing upon the question of a future life." Price 5 cents each.

## How, When, and Where Should we Pray?

It must be admitted that at the present time, as to *quantity*, there is a large amount of praying done, but as to *quality*, it is questionable if the largest proportion of it is up to the standard of purity required by Him to whom it is addressed. It is also doubtful, we think, whether the praying of to-day is, as to the times and places of utterance, in accordance with the examples set before us by the Son of God, his apostles, and other holy men of the Scriptures.

In these days there is too much attention given to "times and seasons" as regards prayer. "Christendom" has its "times" of prayer and its appointed "seasons" of prayer, and like the Pharisees of old, "they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking" (Matt. vi. 7). In fact, to judge from appearances, a great many Christians (so called) seem to think that the great qualification of a Christian is to be able to deliver audibly and extemporaneously a long finely-pointed prayer, no matter how many "vain repetitions" it may contain, or how little the person may know or believe the real *faith* which is in Christ Jesus; which is "the righteousness of God," "unto all and upon all them that believe."—Rom. iii. 20-22, 28; 2 Tim. iii. 15.

Any person who has paid strict attention to the bearing of Scripture on the subject of prayer will have noticed that mention of meetings appointed for the purpose of promiscuous prayer is very rare indeed. In fact the writer is not aware of a single pointed instance in the whole Bible where meetings were previously appointed by Christians simply for the purpose of prayer, as is done in modern times. Of course we are aware that on two or three special occasions several of the early disciples were together in one place engaged in prayer, but we are not told that in these instances the meetings were previously appointed or agreed upon for that purpose.

During the time Herod had Peter in prison, "prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him," and when the angel released him, from prison "he came to the house of Mary the mother of John \* \* where many were gathered together praying."—Acts xii. 5, 12. We are not told that these disciples were gathered together for the express purpose of praying, but if we were it would only prove the exception to the rule.

Nevertheless it might be possible that those gathered together on that occasion came together for the specific purpose of praying, but if so, it is evident that it was for the purpose of offering up a united prayer to God for the deliverance of Peter from prison. But this is quite different from the purposeless prayer meetings usually held in this 19th century. Many prayer meetings held in these days are for the purpose of getting up a "feeling," as it is called. In the first century the people got the feeling first and did the praying afterwards.

The early disciples did not hold protracted prayer meetings for the purpose of converting *immortal* souls in order that said souls might be saved from eternal torment. Instead of this they went about preaching the word, "the gospel," the good news of the *coming* of God's Kingdom, in order that people (*mortal* souls) might believe and be saved therein. For proof of this see—Mark i. 4; Matt. iv. 17-23; vi. 33; ix. 35; xiii. 19; Luke iv. 43; ix. 1, 2, 3, 11; viii. 1; xiii. 28; Acts viii. 12-25; xix. 8-10; xxviii. 30, 31; xxvi. 6, 7; xx. 25; Dan. ii. 44; vii. 13-27. Jesus told his apostles to preach this "Gospel to every creature" (person), and added: "He that believeth [it] and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (condemned).—Mark xvi. 15, 16. In those days it was "the Scriptures that were able to make" men "wise unto salvation through *faith* which is in Christ Jesus."—2 Tim. iii. 15. It was necessary to have some knowledge of the Scriptures and faith in what they taught in order to be saved (verse 14).

Instead of people being converted at prayer meetings, neither Christ nor the apostles scarcely ever prayed in the presence of the unconverted. Christ, instead of praying in the presence of the multitudes "sent them away, then he went up into a mountain apart to pray; and when the evening was come, he was alone." It will be seen that he did not even take his disciples with him.—Matt. xiv. 23. On another occasion "He said to his disciples, sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder." Matt. xxvi. 36. "And he went away again the second time and prayed."—verse 42. "And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed."—Mark i. 35; see also Luke v. 16; ix. 18.

It is evident from these passages and from what he said to his disciples that Christ believed and taught secret prayer—*i.e.*, prayer that was intended for the ear of God only. Christ said to his disciples, "When thou prayest—not sometimes when thou prayest, but *when thou prayest—thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou when thou prayest enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.*"—Matt. vi. 5, 6.

This is plain and to the point. Is not this, which Christ condemns, just precisely what we see practised in modern times by those who are called Christians? Do we not see them make long and loud prayers before men, sometimes on the street corners and sometimes in their synagogues, and do they not seem to *love* to do it in this way instead of in private so as to be heard by Him only who is able to answer prayer. If people would pray in private, it would show that they had no desire to exhibit their godliness to the world at large, when by so doing they are simply demonstrating that their righteousness consists in being self-righteous. If we are really righteous in the sight of God it will not be necessary to call the attention of the world to it by blowing a trumpet in the shape of long, loud and public prayer and thanksgiving. If we are really "the salt of the earth" it will be seen and known of men without calling their attention to it through exhibiting our sanctimonious qualities to the world through public praying.

All the prayers of holy men recorded in the Bible are very short, taking usually from five seconds to about five minutes to utter them. Christ said, "When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the Gentiles do: for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him."—Matt. vi. 7, 8. Yes, so it is; the Gentiles of to-day, those of the Churches, are very much addicted to vain repetitions and seem to think, judging from the length of their prayers in many cases, that "they shall be heard for their much speaking." So they are heard, and likewise have "their reward." They are heard of men, and also have their reward of men and women. The reward they receive consists in the honor they get from their fellows—not from God.

People as a rule pray at certain set times because they think it is a *duty*, not that they really desire some particular favor of God for which they are justified in asking. We believe that prayer should be spontaneous and impromptu; that people should pray secretly to God whenever and wherever the occasion makes it necessary. This would do away with the absurdity of set times and stereotyped prayers. If we pray privately to God when the occasion makes it necessary, we will then be apt to pray in simplicity, and our pleadings will no doubt be more earnest and pure than if we prayed before men, and them not our brethren in Christ. It is not always necessary to enter a closet in order to pray secretly. Privacy seems to be the thing required, and we should "speak (or pray) from the abundance of the heart."—Luke vi. 45.

We have instances of spontaneous prayer mentioned several places in the Bible. The thief on the cross prayed Christ, "Save me when thou comest into thy king-

dom." This is short and to the point and was immediately answered. Christ knew that the thief had need of salvation before the thief expressed his desire, but it was necessary for him to ask, or pray for it "from the abundance of the heart." "Ask and it shall be given you" are the words of Christ.—Matt. vii. 7. But we must not "ask amiss that we may consume it upon our lusts or pleasures."—James iv. 3. We think it foolishness and asking amiss, for a preacher to pray the Lord in the evening after he and his whole congregation no doubt, have had three good meals, to "give us this day our daily bread." This seems nothing short of mockery. Paul says, "Let all things be done decently and in order."—1 Cor. xiv. 40. A great many of the prayers of the clergy partake, to a large extent, of the nature of sermons. They tell God a great many things that He knows better than themselves: instead of confining themselves to prayer and thanksgiving. But they must say something to fill in the time and make a long flowery prayer for the sake of appearance to their audience.—See Matt. xxiii. 14; and Luke xx. 47. They are paid for praying as well as for preaching. The Pharisee of old had a good deal to tell God about himself, but it amounted to nothing in comparison with the humble and short petition, "God be merciful to me a sinner," uttered by the publican.—Luke xviii. 9-14.

Although long prayers are not necessary, sometimes frequent pleadings are, as shown by Christ in the parable of the importunate widow.—See Luke xviii. 1-8—especially verse 5. This woman came so often with her pleadings to the unjust judge that he finally gave way, "And shall not God avenge his own elect, which cry day and night unto him, though he bear long with them." By our frequent pleading for any favor, we show our intense desire for the object of our prayer to be bestowed upon us.

Of course we do not think it wrong for brethren of Christ, "when they come together into one place," to pray audibly as occasion may require; but we do think it out of harmony with the words of Christ to pray audibly in *public* gatherings. We think it more in accordance with the spirit of Christ to refrain from public prayer even when a brother is giving, or about to deliver, a lecture in the interests of the one faith. The lecturer can ask God's assistance and guidance privately before commencing his lecture, and he can return thanks in the same manner at the conclusion, or shortly after. We think prayer and communion with God too sacred a thing to be dragged in the mud and mire of an audience of the world. We have Christ as our example in this, and so far as we can see the Apostles are in harmony with Him.

In the following places it is recorded that the early disciples prayed collectively:—Acts iv. 24-31; xii. 12; xiii. 3; xx. 36; xxi. 5. It will be seen by reading the context in each instance that these were special and rare occasions; not being common practice; nor is it apparent that these meetings were appointed for the purpose of prayer before hand, as is done by many of the popular churches in these days. There was "the hour of prayer" (Acts iii. 1) under the Mosaic ministry and so were there many other things instituted then that were not to be practised by Christians in the present dispensation, although it is quite true that some of the Christians in the first century did for some time hang onto a portion of the "shadow of things to come."

Paul and Silas, when at Philippi, went "on the Sabbath" "out of the city by a river-side where prayer was wont to be made; and sat down and spake unto the women which resorted thither."—Acts xvi. 13. It is evident from the next verse that Paul went to this resort, not to pray, but to enlighten the people; not to assist at a prayer-meeting; for we learn that "a certain woman named Lydia \* \* which worshipped God did attend unto the things which were spoken of Paul," and "was baptized and her household." It is not stated that Paul and Silas engaged in prayer there, but verse 16 intimates that they afterwards "went to prayer." We are not told either where or in what manner they prayed, or even if they prayed at all; in fact it is to some extent evident from the context that they did not pray at all on that occasion.

It is a notable fact that the Apostles attended religious gatherings in the synagogues and elsewhere for the purpose of preaching Christ and his gospel instead of going to these places to worship and pray. "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them [the Jews in their synagogues.—Acts xvii. 1] \* \* and reasoned with them out of the Scriptures"—not to engage in prayer.—Acts xvii. 1, 2; ix. 20. That Paul practised private prayer we believe is evident from Acts ix. 11. So did Peter as can be seen from Acts x. 9-21. When he undertook to bring Dorcas to life, he did not ask God to do this favor until he put the people "all forth" from the room, then he kneeled down and prayed to his heavenly Father in secret, and his Father granted the favour.—Acts ix. 40, 41. Elisha did likewise on a similar occasion.—2 Kings iv. 33. Cornelius the first Gentile convert, a devout man, prayed apparently in private; and his prayers were heard.—(Acts x. 30); notwithstanding this it was necessary for him to be told by Peter certain things he ought to do in order to be saved, among other things he was "commanded" by Peter "to be baptized in the name of the Lord."—ver. 44-48.

If we wish our prayers to be answered we must "*believe*" that we shall "receive" that for which we ask.—Mark xi. 24.

We "must ask in faith, nothing wavering."—Jas. i. 6.

It is the opinion of the writer that the great mass of prayer is merely a matter of form without the least expectation that the prayers will be answered in one case out of a thousand. In fact in most cases it would be a great surprise to those who pray, if their prayers were answered. It is best first, to feel that we need a thing; second, to ask ourselves if it is right and according to the teachings of the Bible that we should have it; third, if right that we should have it, to see if we can acquire it by our own exertions, and if not, to ask God to grant it.

What would any parent think of a child that would continually ask for the thing which the child could possess by stretching out the arm?

It is not necessary to appoint any special day or time for giving thanks, for we have plenty to thank God for at all times. The national Thanksgiving day is another mockery of the world, considering the way it is observed. It is the world's set time for giving thanks in various ways, some of which are very ungodly.

From what we have deduced it is evident that it is not necessary to have a church or synagogue in which to pray. Paul says, "I will therefore that men pray in every place (R.V.) lifting up holy hands without doubting."—1 Tim. ii. 8. In praying we should be humble and devoted.—Luke 18:9-14—EDITOR.

## Future of the Jewish Nation.

And say unto them, thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen (Gentiles), whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: AND I WILL MAKE THEM ONE NATION in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and ONE KING (Jesus) shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all.—Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 22.

Subscriptions received for THE GOOD NEWS, Vol. 2:—Previously acknowledged, \$90; Jas. Riddle, \$1; P. DeGeer, \$1; J. McKewon, \$1; Mr. Adams, \$1; Wm. Dafeo, \$1; J. E. Lent, \$5; E. Wilkins, \$1; P. Chase, \$1; G. A. Skinner, \$1; Mrs. C. Lee, \$1; J. M. Eike, \$1; C. L. Clark, \$1; T. Walker, \$1; M. A. McLeod, \$1. Deficit for Vol. 1, (1886), \$29.50; T. Walker, 50c.; M. A. McLeod, 50c.; Mrs. Smith 50c.; remaining deficit for Vol. 1, \$28.

There are a few of our subscribers who have not yet sent in the amount of subscription for Vol. 2. We wish they would remit the amount at once, if convenient, as we wish to give a statement of the financial standing of our paper in next issue. Please do not overlook this.

"The Gospel of Christ Nullified by the Tradition of the Churches," being an appeal to thinking people, by W. Brittle. I can supply the above at 15 cents each. A. Ross 188 W. Bookseller, Belleville Ont., Canada.



## Christianity a Failure,

COMPARED TO THE RELIGION OF MAHOMED.

At the recent English Church congress Rev. Isaac Taylor, dean of York, threw a large bucket of cold water on the scheme of extending religious work in Southern Asia and Africa by declaring that Islamism as a missionary religion is more successful than Christianity, and that all efforts to convert Mohammedans have failed. In his address he showed that according to the census reports the Mohammedan population of India was increasing at the rate of over half a million a year, while the converts to Christianity amounted to only one-tenth of that number. He also stated that four-fifths of the converts became Roman Catholics. He then showed that the missionary societies of the country used \$2,500,000 per year in carrying on their work, while the Mohammedan missionaries are self-supporting. Christian missions in other heathen lands were even more costly, and productive of smaller results. Thus, in Western Africa it required \$65,000 and 300 European and native preachers to convert 306 adult natives. In one year \$60,000 was expended in supporting missionaries in Palestine, Persia, Arabia and Egypt, and the result was the conversion of one weak-minded girl, supported in an orphan asylum at Jerusalem. In Ceylon, during last year, 374 missionaries and teachers were supported at an expense of more than \$50,000, and 307 converts were reported. It was also affirmed that quite a large proportion of those reported as converts were the wives and children of native preachers and teachers, who were supported by missionary societies.

Canon Taylor's statements have been replied to by several persons who have resided in Asia and Africa. It has apparently been shown that while the Mohammedan population of India has increased 10 per cent; during ten years the Christian population has gained nearly 20 per cent. The fact, however, remains undisputed that the Mohammedans make about a thousand converts for every one made by Christians. It is also admitted that the Christian converts come from the poorest classes of the native population. That Christianity has been of great value to Islamism in making converts in India seems obvious. It broke up many barbarous practices of the Hindoo creed, abolished the suttee and brought the veneration of idols into disrepute. As the natives lost their regard for the old religion they were ready to adopt another. The religion of the prophet of Mecca called for fewer changes of habit than did Christianity. It allows the Hindoo convert to retain four wives and as many concubines as he wishes. It is comparatively simple and easy to understand.

A convert is not required to pass an examination on the thirty-nine articles of the Episcopal Church before he can be confirmed, or to understand the system of theology as presented by Calvin. He is only required to acknowledge that "there is but one God and Mohammed is his prophet," to believe the Koran, to repeat certain prayers, to tell the truth, and to abstain from the use of alcohol. Throughout Southern Asia and Africa the convert to Mohammedism immediately finds himself in the midst of many friends. The convert to Christianity, however, will probably have no friends outside of the mission station and they will be members of another race. Observation apparently shows that a high form of civilization must precede the introduction of Christianity.

Roman conquest led to the introduction of civilization throughout most of Europe. This civilization prepared the people for receiving Christianity. It is true that it was a heathen civilization, but it elevated and enlarged the intellect, and prepared people for receiving and comprehending a better religion than they had ever known. Christianity has certainly made very little progress in Africa, and perhaps it never will till the people are more enlightened than they now are.—*Utica Globe.*

## Concerning Gen. ii. 17.

LA FAYETTE NORRIS.

A few years ago, in a discussion with Eld. P. W. Hough, I made the assertion that the Heb. preposition translated "in," in Gen. ii. 27, could properly be translated "after." But I could not at that time give my authority for that statement. I afterwards found that Storrs was my authority. Below, I give an extract from Bro. Grant's letters from Ireland, in which he fully justifies me in my statement. I have long been satisfied that you cannot prove, or disprove a doctrine by a single preposition. Most prepositions have more than one meaning.

I believe the readers of the *HERALD* will conclude with me, that Elder Grant's exposition of Gen. ii. 27, is much more reasonable and Scriptural than Elder McKim's.

"There is another fact of some importance relating to this passage of Scripture. The Hebrew preposition *be*, rendered *in*, is translated in thirteen different ways, but only three of the thirteen could be used in this text, which are, *in*, *after*, and *against*. The choice of the right preposition depends entirely upon the translator's understanding of the passage. *Against* the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, does not express a clear idea. Then the choice is between the two prepositions *in* and *after*. *After* the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die, makes just as good sense as *in* the day. In Num. xviii. 26 the Hebrew preposition *be* is correctly and necessarily rendered both *in* and *after*, as follows: 'Also in the day of the first fruits, when ye bring a new meat offering unto the Lord, *after* your weeks be out ye shall have a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work.' It would not make sense to say 'in your weeks be out.' The sense requires that both *in* and *after* should be used in this verse. In Gen. ii. 17 and Num. xviii. 26, the words 'in the day' are a correct translation of the Hebrew words *be yom*; and it would be just as proper to render each *after* the day, provided the word *after* expresses the correct idea. Genesis, the noted Hebrew lexicographer says: 'Where the mind rests more on the end of a period, and spoken therefore of time already past, the preposition *be* should be rendered *after*.' This is just the case in Gen. ii. 17. The Creator was calling the attention of Adam to the fact that death must follow if he ate of the forbidden tree; not that he should die *in* the day he ate; for, when explaining the penalty he says: 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *until* thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.' Gen. iii. 19.

"As the translators understood that the death mentioned in Gen. ii. 17 was a moral one, which took place the day Adam disobeyed and became a sinner, it was quite natural that they should render the passage 'in the day,' instead of 'after' the day; but the latter corresponds with all the facts in the case."

—*Herald of Life.*

## Just to the Point.

The following extract is from an article which appeared in the *RESTITUTION* of quite recent date, from the pen of Bro J. F. Wagoner of Floral City, Florida. It is, as we think, just to the point respecting our preaching as touching upon the subject of "Fair Chance," and as to whether we shall in this age preach for the benefit of the people of this age, or that of a people of the next age:

I often see in print now such expression as 'advanced truth' 'liberal views' 'broader views of God's plan.' Now without a desire to be censorious I would suggest that we all advance with the truth. This is done by 'letting the truth of God dwell in us,' by being learners in the school of Christ. Some are so concerned about the salvation of nations that are dead and the unborn nations of the coming ages that they can hardly preach a present salvation to present dying men and women. They remind me of a character in the school books, a Mr. Phantom, who had gigantic schemes that interfered with his attention to any small affair, and of whom it was said that "between the great things that he could not do and the small things he would not do,

his life would pass and nothing be accomplished."

What has led to this false sympathy for millions that bear the same relation to God's plan that the surplus bloom of the fruit tree bears to the fully developed and perfect fruit that golden autumn pours into the lap of the husbandman? What would you think of the orchardist who wasted his sympathy upon the fallen bloom and premature fruit of his trees even to the neglect of healthy vigorous fruit? It may shock the tender sensibilities of some to institute such a comparison when such high values have been placed upon one of the human race. One human being has been put in the balance with millions of worlds and by this unjust valuation estimated as of more value than all these worlds. There are no such exalted views of man's worth found in the Bible. Here is God's estimate of human beings taken as nations: "Behold the nations are as the drop of a bucket and are counted as the small dust of the balance." As the small particles of the dust on the scales does not affect the true weight of the article weighed, so the loss of nations will not affect the true balance of God's plan. No wonder in view of this the Psalmist exclaims, "What is man that thou art mindful of him."

Out of the great moral forest of humanity God will select the material to accomplish his purpose, and who shall dictate to him how to dispose of the surplus? This surplus of human beings is to God's plan what the scaffolding is to the building; when not needed it is taken away. And who will object to the removal of the unsightly mass? Let us hear no false sympathy for the scaffolding, it served its purpose with the architect and now let it perish.

Do not have any fears that any really valuable material will be overlooked; this matter of the selecting is in the hands of God, and remember that material that to us would appear faultless, in the sight of God it may be full of blemishes. Never lose sight of the great truth that "the judge of all the earth will do right." The false hope of universal restoration or that God will finally bring all to salvation weakens the force of the gospel; it licenses men to say, "If I am not saved now I shall in some coming age and now I will enjoy the pleasures of sin in this life." That this is its tendency the writer has good reason to believe.

The destruction of whole nations will no more interfere with God's purpose to fill the earth with his glory than the rejection of a single individual now of the offer of life and salvation will affect God's purpose of selecting the ruling element for the coming kingdom. Both these grand purposes will be accomplished. In this age the gospel calls or selects individuals for rulers in the coming age; hence "in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him," but in the next age God deals with the race nationally. "But the nation and kingdom that will not serve shall utterly perish." The saved individuals of the past and the present ages will constitute the Lord's cabinet of rulers for the coming age, hence it cannot be said that this part of God's plan is a failure for it accomplishes the purpose for which it was intended. In the age to come there will be enough of the saved nations to fill the earth with the glory of God, therefore that will prove a failure, for God says my word shall not return to me void but it shall accomplish that which I please and shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it." Thus the grand consummation is reached, the earth filled with God's glory, his word fulfilled, the original purpose accomplished, and God vindicated by all creatures that then enjoy the blessings of that age. The present age demands all our energies, for as we near the end the danger increases, crime is multiplied, infidelity becomes more bold, the truth is more fiercely attacked than ever before; hence let us be diligent more watchful and steadfast in the truth.

## Follies of Fashion.

MRS. HENRY WARD BEECHER ON MODERN FEMININE DRESS.

There are many who could rejoice if the chains fashion weaves around her subjects could be made less galling, and the follies and absurdities which they

do not fail to recognise a little less obvious. They do not hesitate to say that those who are looking after the many evils that infest the land should give some thought to reform in fashion, or make some effort to curtail its power.

Judging from the experience of those who have attempted reformation in this evil, it would be "as the voice of one crying in the wilderness"—wasted breath, time spent for naught. The pulpit and the press have spoken on this subject for years. And what has been the result? The changes in fashion are becoming more frequent, and certainly

## NO LESS ABSURD AND UNNATURAL.

Were it not for the title, a fashion magazine might be taken for *Punch* or *The Budget of Fun*. Yet it is from the fashion plates that the modiste plans her customers' dresses. Many who acknowledge their desire for a reformation in fashion, living in glass houses, dare not throw stones themselves. Willing that others should make the attack, yet without the moral courage to cast off their shackles, they stand at a distance, ready to join the ranks of the victorious.

Why not commence, good friends, with your own personal adornments? Throw aside frizzeters, which hide many a beautiful brow. Brush the hair smoothly, coil it gracefully around, and let us once more see the head as God made it. Lay aside, for better use, the yards of silk that now sweep the street, the piles of lace and ribbons, bustles, puffs, and flouncies, and then observe the difference between a natural figure and

## ON—CREATED BY FASHION.

But if we tell those who are thus fettered that by independent action in this matter they can do more good than the best writers of the age could accomplish, what would be the reply? Something as follows:—

"Oh, bless us! We wouldn't do anything of that sort for the world. We should be happy to see a less expensive and more simple style of dress. It would be refreshing and comforting, but we could never take the initiative. Such a course would make us so conspicuous. No one person, even by making a martyr of herself, can effect any material reform. It must be done by a united simultaneous effort."

We have heard this reply often. We cannot but think them cowardly arguments, and pardon us, not truthful. Had all reformers reasoned thus, what would now be the condition of the civilised world?

## FASHION IS A TYRANT.

and until women have strength of mind to defy her and henceforth be governed by true taste, there will be no release from her absurdities. The old look upon the vagaries of modern fashion with much reproof and scorn. But do not many of us who belong to that class remember our grandmothers' prevailing costume. It is well to be perfectly honest when criticising the customs and habits of others, and we cannot truthfully say that the grandchildren are more absurd in their style of dress than were their grandmothers before them, although there is this in the favor of the ancient costume, the styles were not so changeable as we find at the present time. Everything new and of the latest importation was as eagerly sought after by the young. After marriage for a few years their devotion to fashion continued unabated.

## AND HER LAWS WERE OBEYED.

even when the ripper judgment rebelled. The richly embroidered "stomacher," the "farthingale," "long bodice," "high-heeled shoes," and endless "trains" all differed from and surpassed anything of the kind that has been for many years, and this held our grandmothers in as rigorous subjection to fashion as their grandchildren yield to at the present day.

For many years powdered hair was the ruling style. Then little by little that was discarded and the hair, rolled tightly from the brow, was gathered with the back hair over a skeleton pillow, and there held by long silver pins. From that,

"With curls on curls they build the hair before, And mount it with a formidable tower; But look behind, and then It dwindle to the pigmy kind."

But it was noticeable in the more ancient times, and is greatly to the honor of our ancestors, that when the

tender olive plants began to cluster about the home, when

"The table grew too small, And the cottage wanted space," fashion was no longer the dominant power, and her votaries discarded their allegiance to her more entirely than the old do now. After forty—sometimes earlier—there was little change in the style of their dress, their thoughts being

## CENTRED MORE ON THE CARE OF THEIR CHILDREN.

than on their own personal adornment. As years passed on and their children and children's children ripened into maturity, the grandmothers even in the highest circle, while often richly clothed, continued to have their garments fashioned under the same mode they were when first home joys began to take precedence of fashion. Unfortunately sometimes their subjection ceased at a period when the fashions were singularly deficient in good taste, but nevertheless to the end of long lives there was no change attempted in their attire.

There seems to be a grown fondness for following fashion to the very extreme, where ever she may lead. Would it not be wise for mothers to reflect a little more earnestly on the strength of temptations that surround their young daughters, and completely absorb the attention even of their little girls? Little girls! Where can we find them now? See children of six, eight, ten years dressed for some entertainment. Childish sports and amusements are quite beneath the notice of these

## OVERDRESSED STYLISH LITTLE LADIES,

now demurely taking their places for a genteel dance—not with father, mother, sisters and brothers, a home dance full of fun, all frolic and childish amusements.

If one would find little girls one of the sweetest things to be sought after, they must go far back into the country, so far that they can find mothers not contaminated with too great love for fashions, but content to dress themselves and daughters neatly, yet with that simplicity which so beautifies childhood. There they are not seen at evening parties, allowed to indulge in late hours and corresponding amusements such as is depriving many city children of the pure, sweet life of young girlhood. When thus indulged they must lose half the advantages our city schools offer. Their vanity is aroused and ministered unto by dresses too costly and elaborate for little girls. Intoxicated by excitement of gay society, and seeing there mothers devoted to such a life, they soon lose all relish for books or study, and certainly for all amusements suitable for their age, and such as will make them strong and healthy.

If mothers will not heed these tokens they are cheating their daughters of solid happiness, and burdening their own souls with a sin which they do not fully realise until old age reveals the full extent of the mischief they have done their children by their own example and by negligent thoughtlessness.—*Toronto Globe.*

[To judge from appearances it is evident that very few of the women "professing godliness" in these days have ever seen the words from Paul where he expresses his "desire" that women ADORN THEMSELVES IN MODEST APPAREL WITH SHAME-FACEDNESS AND SOBRIETY; not with broidered hair or gold, or pearls, or costly array; but (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works. "Let the woman," he continues, "learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.—1 Tim. ii. 8-13.

It is also evident from this that the man was intended to be the head of the family, but things in the domestic economy have sadly changed. If men of mature age had their way, there would be less ugliness and brainless folly in the adornment of the fair sex. Whiskey and tobacco are two great evils, but we think the fashion in dress adopted by the ladies is not second to either of them. We often think that if it were true, that there is such a place as a hell of perpetual fire in which the wicked are to dwell forever in torment, that the inventors and those who introduce the ridiculous and hurtful fashions in dress would be likely to inhabit the hottest corner.—*Ed. Good News.*



# The Good News.

"Fear not: for, behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people."

VOL. II.

BELLEVILLE, ONT., 1888.

NO. 12

## Possessed with Devils.

### CHAPTER III.

It still remains, that we point out the inconveniences attending the common explication of the Gospel demoniacs, and the advantages which result from the account given of them in the two preceding chapters.

Some may be ready to ask, "Where this zeal to shew that revelation doth not countenance the doctrine of real possessions? What prejudice can the Gospel suffer from this doctrine? And what advantage can it derive from the contrary one? The very adversaries of real possessions allow that it was a matter of indifference with respect to the evidence of Christianity, whether those esteemed demoniacs were really such, or only laboured under a natural disease, inasmuch as in either case a real miracle was performed, when their cure was effected. But what can be more evident than that the ejection of devils from the bodies of men is a greater miracle than the cure of natural disorders? What a lustre doth it reflect on the character of Christ, to see him first compelling them to confess his name and then condemning them to silence? Was it not a wise dispensation to permit the devil, about this time, to give some unusual proofs of his existence, power, and malice, in attacking men's bodies, in order to convince them what a dangerous enemy he was to their souls? Above all, was it not fit, and even necessary, that he who came into the world as the great antagonist of the prince of darkness, should give a *sensible and public* specimen and proof of his power over him and his confederates by dispossessing them, and hereby raise our hopes of his perfect triumph over them at the end of this world? In a word, the more carefully we examine the miracles of Jesus relating to the possessed, the more clearly shall we perceive their strict connection with the great end of the whole Christian dispensation, the redemption of mankind. Scarce, therefore, can we injure Christianity more than by denying the reality of diabolical possessions." In answer to this reasoning, I observe,

1.—That it is not supported by the testimony of the Scripture. Neither our Saviour nor his apostles did ever assert or intimate that the devil enjoyed an extraordinary liberty at the time of Christ's coming into the world; much less did they attempt to account for his having such liberty then allowed him, or shew that it was fit that it should be granted. Not one of the reasons assigned for the devil's giving some unusual proofs of his power at this period, are taken notice of in the New Testament. The more weighty and important those reasons are supposed to be, so much the more difficult is it to account for this silence. If it was even necessary that Christ should exhibit a specimen of his triumph over the devil, by dispossessing him from the bodies of men, how comes it to pass that dispossessions are never spoken of in this view, by those who certainly best understood their intention? Whenever God commissions his messengers to perform miracles for the conviction of mankind, he instructs them to explain to the world the great ends proposed by them. This was the case with regard to all the prophets, both of the Old and New Testament. They never left it, nor could they fitly leave it to human conjecture to determine for what purposes their miracles were wrought. Nor can we learn what those purposes were in any other method, than by the declarations of a prophet, or by the nature of the works themselves; and the latter will give us very little assistance without the former. The silence of Scripture, therefore, concerning what is supposed to have been the grand and peculiar design of the cure of demoniacs, is a sufficient reason for rejecting it, unless it can be clearly and certainly inferred from the nature of the work itself, which no one will affirm, that understands it aright.

2.—The entire reasoning we are now examining, is built upon this false hypothesis, viz., that the spirits who

were thought to take possession of mankind, were *devils or fallen angels*. But we have shewn, that possessions were always referred to such human spirits as were supposed to be converted into demons; that there is only *one* devil, and that he is never mentioned in Scripture in any connection with the subject before us. All the arguments therefore urged to prove the propriety and necessity of his extraordinary agency in the age of the Gospel, and of Christ's public triumph over him, by expelling him from human bodies, militate against the Christian dispensation; and if they proved anything, would prove that God ought to have allowed the devil a power, and afforded Christ a triumph, which were not granted.

3.—The reasoning stated above proceeds upon another false supposition, viz., that possessions were more frequent in the age of the Gospel than at any other time: a supposition contradicted by all the monuments of antiquity. So that had it been true that the Scripture had referred possessions to the devil, it would not have followed even from hence, that the devil gave any *unusual* proofs of his power at the commencement of the Christian era.

4.—Were it true, not only that the devil was the spirit who possessed men's bodies, and that possessions were more frequent in the age of the Gospel than any other; yet the cases of reputed possessions described in the Gospel do not contain any convincing proof of the power and interposition either of the devil or any evil spirit. The agency of demons (whatever spirits you understand hereby) is not an object of sight; their entrance into the human body falls not under the notice of any of our senses. There is not, therefore, the same evidence to be had of it as there is of a person's being *diseased or dead*. Accordingly the writers on demonology find it necessary to lay down rules for distinguishing true from pretended possessions, and to appeal to certain outward supernatural symptoms (such as the gifts of tongues and prophecy), as proofs of an immediate inspiration: thus making one miracle necessary to attest the reality of another. It seems then to be the general sense of mankind, what is indeed self-evident, that we cannot yield a rational assent to the reality of possessions, without some proof of it distinct from the fact itself; because it is not subject to the notice of our senses.

Apply these observations to the Gospel demoniacs. What evidence is there of their being really possessed? We have seen that their outward symptoms are so far from necessarily arguing the presence and operation of demons in the human body that they are apparently the same with those in natural disorders; and that there is not a single circumstance attending their case, which furnishes an instance or proof of any supernatural agency. Nor hath the Gospel laid down any such rules as those just now mentioned, in order to enable us to distinguish true from pretended possessions; or offered any proof at all of the reality of possessions, though some such proof was apparently necessary, and even universally allowed to be so in all other cases. Nay, the most strenuous asserters of Gospel demoniacs are forced at last to build their faith in it, upon the supposed testimony of Christ: which is giving up the very point they undertook to establish, viz., that the demons themselves gave evident proof of their power in the demoniacs spoken of in the New Testament.

If the foregoing observations are just, the very foundation of the reasoning stated at the beginning of this section is not solid. It is built upon this principle, that the devil gave unusual proofs of his power when the Gospel was first published, by more frequently possessing mankind at that period than at any other, and this principle is thought to be supported by the case of the Gospel demoniacs. But neither were reputed possessions more frequent in the first age of the Gospel than in the preceding and following ages, nor are those related in the New Testament ever referred to the devil, nor do they

contain any proof of any supernatural agency.

5.—We may state further that the ends said to be proposed by Providence in permitting the devil about the time of Christ to exercise an extraordinary power over mankind, and in expelling him from their bodies, are such as could not be answered by the cure of the gospel demoniacs. These ends are, the convincing mankind how dangerous an enemy he is to the souls of men, and the affording Christ an opportunity of gaining a *public* victory and triumph over him, or of giving the world a *sensible* specimen and proof of his own superior power. But even were we to admit, that those called demoniacs were really possessed by demons, yet the expulsion of demons would be a proof only of Christ's power over human ghosts, not over the devil, who is totally unconcerned in the present question. Nay, were we to grant further, that by demons we are not to understand human spirits, but the devil and fallen angels, and that they did really possess mankind, yet their disposssession could not answer the ends which, it is pretended, were proposed by them, because it did not contain a *public and conspicuous*, or indeed any clear and certain proof of Christ's power over the devil and his confederates. What was observed above with respect to the *entrance* of demons into the human body, is equally true with respect to their *ejection* from it; it is not an object of sight, nor doth it fall within the notice of any of our bodily senses. You may know when a disease is cured, or a dead man restored to life; but what evidence is there that a demon is expelled, arising from the work itself? We find that those who undertook this work, thought it necessary to offer some external proof of the success of their enterprise. The Jewish exorcists spoken of by Josephus, ordered the demon as he went out, *to overthrow a cup of water, placed at a small distance*, as a proof of his expulsion. And of Apollonius Tyaneus it is related, that with the same view he made the demon whom he cast out, *throw down a statue*. These impostors, void of shame as they were in many respects, had not sufficient assurance to expect the world would believe they had a power of expelling demons, without producing some evidence of the fact. We find nothing similar to this in the conduct of Christ, a plain proof, that by the disposssession of demons, he meant nothing more than (what was obvious to all) the cure of a disease.

If you say, that though the reality of dispossessions cannot be demonstrated from the works themselves, yet that it may be established by the testimony of revelation: I answer, that by resting the reality of dispossessions on revelation, you make it merely an object of *faith*, and of *sense*; and consequently the ejection of demons could not, in this case, furnish a *sensible and public* proof of Christ's power over them nor indeed furnish any proof of it at all to unbelievers. For the proof would not arise from the miracle, but from the declaration of Christ concerning it; and consequently the miracle would *pre-suppose* faith, instead of *begetting* it, and be useless to those for whose conviction it was designed. Equally useless, would it also be even to believers; for what evidence can arise from the miracle itself, when the very reality of it is known only by the testimony of the performer? To propose *invisible* miracles as means of conviction, is not to enlighten, but to insult our understanding. Well may unbelievers ask, "Are such works as are totally hid from human views, the august proofs by which the wisdom of God saw fit to seal the divine mission of the great Redeemer?" As reasonably might we be commanded to see in the dark, as to believe without evidence only, or, which is the same thing, with such evidence only, as we are not able to perceive? But in this, as in a multitude of other instances, the objections of infidelity are not founded upon genuine Christianity, but upon gross misrepresentations of it by Christians. Agreeably to the wisdom that shone

forth in his whole behaviour, Christ performed such miracles as were open to the view of all men, and left all men to judge of them, as it was highly necessary he should, by the nature of the works themselves, not by any explanation of his concerning them. Instead of teaching men to credit the reality of his miracles, on account of his testimony, he demanded their assent to his testimony, on account of the reality of his miracles, which were subjected to the examination of their senses and natural reason, the competent and sole judges concerning them.

Now, if the disposssession of demons, even supposing the fact to be real, and the common explication of it to be just, be indiscernible by mankind, and unsupported by any evidence arising from the work itself; this miracle could not be a *public display* of Christ's power, or a *visible victory* over the devil, and a *sensible* manifestation of the glories of his conqueror. And as it could not answer this end, we may be sure it could not be designed to answer it by that wisdom which cannot err. Why then do Christians, without any authority from revelation, assert the propriety and necessity of Christ's giving a *conspicuous* specimen of his power over the devil, by dispossessions, when it is so obvious, that no such specimen was or could be afforded thereby on any interpretation of demoniacal possessions? Why will they not place the important doctrine of man's redemption by Christ, on its proper basis, the express and repeated testimony of the divine word? Why do they ground it on the grossest fables of the idolatrous Heathens, to which it bears no manner of relation? Happy would it be for the gospel, would its learned advocates content themselves with explaining and vindicating those evidences of its divinity, which the gospel itself offers, and rely less on arguments of their own invention. The last method may be more flattering to the human mind; but it ever exposes the cause it is meant to serve. It is indeed as indecent as it is dangerous, for the wit of man to dictate to divine wisdom what measures it ought to pursue.

6.—It is urged, "that the ejection of demons is a *greater* miracle than the cure of natural disorders." But this may as easily be denied as affirmed without any great fear of contradiction; it being difficult to determine with certainty concerning miracles so very different in their natures, which of them may require the superior degree of power. Besides, unless we knew exactly the degrees of power possessed by demons, how can we determine what degrees of power are necessary to dislodge them from the bodies of men? We need not, however, enter into this question; the principles just now established being a sufficient reply to the objection we are here considering. Miracles designed for the conviction of mankind, as those of Christ were, must be obvious to the sense of mankind: for otherwise they cannot answer the end proposed by them. The bare ejection of demons therefore, how great a miracle soever it may be in itself, or how much superior to the cure of bodily disorders, is *no miracle* at all with regard to mankind, can carry no conviction to them, because it doth not fall under the notice of their senses. In a word, inasmuch as there is no clear and certain proof of the reality either of possessions or dispossessions, Christianity can derive no advantage from the common doctrine concerning them.

7.—On the contrary, this doctrine doth Christianity the greatest prejudice in many respects.

With some, perhaps it may weigh but little to observe, that the common explication of the scripture demoniacs gives occasion to numberless superstitions; particularly to those shameless impostures, the possessions and exorcisms of the Roman church; and thus discredits the wonderful cures performed by Christ upon demoniacs, and brings disgrace upon the christian name. If you choose to call this only an *abuse* of that explication, it is nevertheless such an abuse as every Chris-

tian should wish to see prevented or removed; especially as it hath occasioned a vast effusion of human blood. But in truth, to represent the gospel as authorising the doctrine of possessions, hath a *natural and necessary tendency* to rivet this superstition in the minds of Christians, which in every age hath been productive of the greatest mischief. A learned writer, of whom we have had frequent occasion to take notice, affirms, *that it is an unquestionable fact, that the evangelic history of the demoniacs hath given occasion to the most scandalous frauds and superstitions, throughout almost every age of the church, the whole trade of exorcisms, accompanied with all the mummeries of frantic and fanatic agitations, having arisen from hence*. And this celebrated writer would willingly persuade the world, that these evils are the consequence of the anti-demoniac system, self-evident as it is, that they wholly arise from his own. But his argument proceeds on a supposition neither true in itself, nor admitted by those against whom he is disputing, *that Jesus and his apostles, instead of rectifying the people's follies and superstitions on this head, chose rather to inflame them, by assuring certain of the disordered that they were really possessed by evil spirits*. After what hath been already offered on this subject, I will not say anything in vindication of Christ and the evangelic history from the false imputation of asserting the doctrine of demoniacal possessions. Nor will I affront the reader's understanding, by proving that those who deny this doctrine, are not answerable for its abuse. What those have to answer for both to God and to mankind, who too hastily represent the gospel as asserting and supporting this doctrine, when they themselves are sensible of its precious tendency and effects, I leave them to consider.

This doctrine prejudices Christianity in another view. It hath been shewn, that all the symptoms ascribed to the gospel demoniacs, are such as belong to natural disorders. And therefore, by asserting that revelation ascribes these disorders to a supernatural cause we do revelation the most material injury; we set it at variance with reason and experience, and fix an indelible reproach on those who professed to be commissioned by God to publish it to the world.

Again, the common doctrine concerning possessions, affects the very foundation on which the gospel is built, the evidence of miracles in general, and the miraculous infliction and cure of diseases in particular.

If demons can afflict grievous diseases, deprive men of their reason and senses, render them dumb and blind, and cause them to suffer the most exquisite torments; they can work miracles: for the infliction of a disease by the agency of any spiritual being, answers to the just definition of a miracle, as an effect produced in the system of nature, contrary to the general rules by which it is governed. All diseases so inflicted are ever represented in scripture as genuine miracles, and as full and sufficient tests of a divine interposition. When Zacharias was struck dumb, and Elymas blind, ought we not, according to the New Testament, to conceive of these effects as real miracles, and to refer them to God alone? Now, if evil spirits are capable of producing the very same effects, how can they mark the immediate hand and agency of God?

Let us next consider how the doctrine of demoniacal possessions affects another species of miracles, the cure of demoniacs. If you understand the ejection of demons in the literal sense, abstracted from the cure of bodily disorders, the miracle in this case is not only secret and insensible, and therefore not adapted to conviction of mankind (as was observed above); but is evidently such as lies within the compass of a demoniacal power. For if demons can enter, they can certainly *quit* the bodies of mankind. Thus you absolutely destroy the validity of one of the most illustrious attestations to Christ's divine commission, his expelling demons, or restoring demoniacs



# THE GOOD NEWS.

Subscriptiona received for THE GOOD NEWS. Vol. 2:—Previously acknowledged, \$116; C. W. Bell, \$1; M. Aigrie, \$1; A. Norman, \$2; L. Tansy, \$1; W. P. Bowman, \$1; M. David, \$1; J. Lowry, (donation) \$5; (total, \$126). Cost of publishing vol. 2, \$145; which leaves a deficit of \$19. Deficit on vol. 1, \$24; received from W. P. Bowman, (donation) \$2, leaving a deficit of \$22; making the total remaining deficit on the two volumes, \$36.

This is the last number of THE GOOD NEWS that will be issued at present, and perhaps for all time. We find that we have not the spare time, under present circumstances, to do justice to the matter required for publication. In fact much that has appeared in the paper from our pen has not been in as good shape as it would have been had we been able to give more attention to the articles.

As there are many other periodicals and papers being published which advocate similar views, more or less, to those to which THE GOOD NEWS has been devoted, we will likely be heard from occasionally by at least a few of our subscribers and readers, through one or more of those, as we intend writing an article occasionally for publication in some one of the papers alluded to. So farewell for the present, hoping that we may all meet in the Kingdom of God when "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and His anointed" (ones).

We see in some of our exchanges that Spurgeon, the "renowned" preacher, is at the present time not in harmony with the body of religionists which he has been connected with in the past. It is understood that they are at variance in consequence of difference of opinion in matters of doctrine. We are glad to learn that Mr. Spurgeon now preaches the good news (gospel) of the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, as the *fifth* universal empire, at the second coming of the Messiah. But he continues, we are sorry to say, inconsistently we think, to preach the pagan doctrine of the immortality of the soul and the blasphemous and worse than barbarous doctrine of the eternal torment of wicked immortal souls—the doctrine which is making infidels by thousands every year. Some of Spurgeon's published sermons contain some of the most blood-curdling teaching on this subject that could well be uttered by any sane person. We believe it to be nothing short of blasphemy and a libel on the character of God to teach this eternal torment doctrine, for which those who teach it will no doubt have to answer to Him whose "mercy endureth for ever." We hope Mr. Spurgeon will keep advancing in scripture truth until he eradicates this monstrous dogma from his mind. Of course, Mr. Spurgeon, no doubt, thinks the scriptures teach this doctrine, but he utterly fails to prove this to be the case, as all must who attempt to deduce the doctrine from "all scripture."

Any one wishing to see what the Scriptures do teach on these subjects, with objections considered, can do so by procuring THE GOOD NEWS, vols. 1 and 2, price 50c., at this office. Address A. Robinson, Bookseller, Belleville, Ontario, Canada.

We have remaining on hand about 100 copies of each number of THE GOOD NEWS that has been issued; in all 24 numbers, composing vols. 1 and 2. We will send the two complete sets for half the price of one, viz.: 50 cents. They are just the thing for general circulation among those not acquainted with the scriptural views of the nature of man, (body, soul and spirit); the nature and duration of future punishment of the wicked, the devil and demons, the Gospel of the Kingdom, Hell, etc. Besides these subjects many others receive attention. The popular doctrine of the Trinity and the pre-existence of Christ are shown to be unscriptural, as well as going to heaven at death. A number of passages which are considered, by those who believe and teach popular theology, to be against the views we advocate, are considered and shown to be in harmony with, instead of against, our contention. Send for the papers, they are worth more than a hundred times the price to the seeker after truth.

"Thou shalt surely die." Gen. iii. 17.—God. Then "thou shalt not surely die."—Gen. iii. 4.—The serpent.  
"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Ezek. 18, 4, 20; Ps. 22, 29, 31, 19; Isa. 55, 8.—God.  
"The soul is immortal and cannot die."—The clergy. Which shall we believe? the serpent and the clergy, or God Almighty?

Below we give a list of the titles to several of the articles which have been published in THE GOOD NEWS, which will give the reader some idea of the nature of the subjects treated on in the two volumes of this paper; wherein the popular teaching concerning the different subjects is shown to be unscriptural and in many cases of heathen origin:—

Soul (not immortal)—its nature considered from a scripture basis; The Destiny of the Wicked; The Gospel; The Necessity of the Reign of Christ (on earth); Hinnom (Greek, Gehenna, English, Hell); The Religions of the Ancient World; Important Statistics; Christianity and Morality; The Devil; The Bible and the Monuments; The Light of the World; Answers and Information for all Enquirers; Dialogue on the Trinity; Did Christ Pre-exist? Uncle Daniel's Bible Class (exegetical); The Angels that Sinned; Immortality and Everlasting Punishment; The Resurrection of the Just; Did Jesus Die to satisfy God's Anger, or to Reveal His Father's Love to us?; The Parable of the Ten Virgins and its Lesson; Prayer and Promise; Reasons why I believe that Human Immortality is Conditional (not inherent, as taught by the Clergy); What is the Gospel; Pessimism; Our Faith and Hope; A Resurrection of the Dead Indispensable to Eternal Life; Our Name (as a religious body); The Promises (made to Abraham and his seed); The Spirits in Prison (the popular view shown to be unscriptural); The Little Horn of Daniel VIII.; The Gospel of the Kingdom; The Kingdom of Messiah; Hope; Spirit; Will the Earth be Burned up; An Essay; The Fall of Satan; Salted with Fire; The Sonship of Christ; Baptism—the mode; Transfigured, Matthew xviii., 2; Debt, Dirt, and the Devil; The Bride Adorned; The Judgment; A Wonderful Dream; To the Church of God in Christ Jesus, Greeting; "Depart and be with Christ"; Mortality and Immortality; Baptism—its necessity; Life and Death; Angels, Archangels and Michael; Satan Hindered Us; Evil Spirits or Devils; "Many Mansions"; Reply to Dr. Wild's Sermon on Man's Immortality; The Thief on the Cross; Baptism—its subjects; A Personal Devil; Unquenchable Fire and the Worm; Has God a Plan; Good News; More Sure Word of Prophecy; Mum Socials; The End of the World; The Breath of Life; The Reply of "A Student of the Bible" to Vox; Glad Tidings of the Coming Age; The Lord's Portion; The Bread of Life; Do Good People go to Heaven; Born Again; Sacrifice and Atonement; Possessed with Devils; One Faith; The Spirit in Man (shown not to be an immortal entity); The Promised Inheritance; What is a Disciple; Tri-Personality; Is Man Immortal; Fatal Mistake; Rome; Perilous Times; The Faith of Irenaeus; The Origin of Evil; Spiritualism; "A New Creature"; Mr. Slade, the Spiritualist Medium; The Body of Christ; Tobacco and its Effects; Matthew xxii., 32, considered; The New Birth, or How an Individual is Born of Water and of Spirit; Thy Kingdom Come; The Meaning of Baptism; Love not the World; Have Faith in God; Jesus soon is Coming; What Hope have you, Friend?; Tobacco and Alcohol; The Authenticity of the Book of Daniel Historically proved; "Great is Your Reward in Heaven"; A Few Questions Answered; A Perpetual Pentecost; Immortality of the Soul; How, When, and Where should we Pray; Future of the Jewish Nation; Concerning Gen. ii., 17; Just to the Point; Follies of Fashion; "Pray Without Ceasing"; Paul in the Body and out of the Body; The Hebrew People in the Light of History and Prophecy; The Rich Man and Lazarus; Matthew x., 28, explained; The Death of Adam; Evil Spirits; etc., etc.

## The Son of Man's Coming.

[Below we reproduce a sermon which was preached some time ago in St. James' Square Presbyterian Church, Toronto, by Dr. Kellogg, of the same city. The sermon originally appeared in print in the Toronto Mail. We reproduce it in THE GOOD NEWS for two reasons,—first, because it is in harmony with the teachings of the Word of God; second, because members of the popular churches will be more apt to read and heed the production than they would if the author were a member of the "little flock"; for, as it was in the days of the apostles so now "as con-

cerning this sect (the little flock) we know that everywhere it is spoken against."—Acts xxviii. 22. Although the glorious truths presented in Mr. Kellogg's sermon have been, with many other kindred truths, resurrected and zealously promulgated by the little flock referred to, for the past fifty years or more, he, apparently, did not deem it fitting the occasion nor the company, to take cognizance of them when mentioning the great men of the world who have in a partial manner, we believe, preached similar views concerning the second coming of Him "whose right it is" to sit on David's throne (Ezek. xxi. 25-27, Luke i. 31-33) for the purpose of blessing the nations (Gen. xxii. 18; Gal. iii. 16) and exalting the low and abasing the high-minded individuals of the earth. Of course the individuals composing this little flock do not assume any high-sounding worldly titles, such as Reverend, Right Reverend, Doctor of Divinity, Dean, Cardinal, Pope, and the like, one of which (Reverend, Pa. cxi. 9) belongs exclusively to God. Consequently it is not reasonable to suppose that fashionable "Christianity" would take any notice of these unassuming people who nevertheless are, like the disciples and ministers of the Church of Christ in the first century, satisfied and consider it an honor to be designated as "servants" (Acts iv. 29; Rom. i. 1; Matt. xxiv. 45-46) and "brethren" (Luke viii. 21; Rom. viii. 29; Heb. ii. 11) of Christ, and who, none the less, "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," in contradistinction to the traditions of men. The flock referred to is mostly made up of the poor, as was also the case in the days of its Founder, for the poor accept the real gospel of Christ more readily than the rich.

When Christ comes again the poor will be looked after in other respects as well as have the gospel preached unto them; and will not be put to shame by fashionable "christians" (so called), for the hungry shall be filled. God's truth shall then not be confined to a little flock, "for all shall know the Lord from the least unto the greatest." And (ultimately) God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, crying, neither shall there be any more PAIN: for the former things are passed away." At this time "the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." (Rev. xxi. 3, 4).

But God "shall (first) send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: Whom the heaven must receive (retain) until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts i. 20, 21.) For Christ now sits on God's throne (Rev. iii. 21) but in the time of "regeneration," "when the Son of Man shall come in His glory," "he shall sit in His own throne," "the throne of his glory." (Matt. xix. 28; xxv. 31); for He must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet." He then "delivers up the Kingdom to God; even the Father; when he (Christ) shall have put down all (opposing) rule, and all authority and power." (1 Cor. xv. 24, 25). "Then (when He comes) shall the King say unto them" (his followers) "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you (in the purpose of God) from the foundation of the world." So, "fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." (Luke xii. 32; Dan. ii. 44, 45; vii. 18, 21, 22, 27) The promise is, that "if we suffer (on account of Christ and the gospel of the Kingdom) we shall also reign with him 'over the nations.'" (2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. iii. 21; ii. 26, 27). Although no much attention is now given to the "little flock," by the popular religionists and worldlings of this age they will receive "in the age to come, eternal life" (Mark x. 30, margin Rev. Version, N.T.), and shall sing the song of the redeemed and experience what is taught in this portion of it:—"Thou" (Christ) "hast made us unto God Kings and Priests and we shall reign on the EARTH." They do not seek to occupy the exalted positions of this world, nor to be exalted to heaven at death, for the reason that God has not promised in His Word either of these exalted positions to the household of faith; and, moreover, His Word teaches us that when we die we are totally dead until Christ comes and raises us from the dead; for we learn,

to the regular exercise of their rational faculties. If you understand the ejection of demons, as including in it the cure of such disorders as are supposed to proceed from the influence of demons, you still destroy the credit of Christ's cure of demoniacs. For if demons can inflict diseases, why may not they as easily remove them? The Fathers expressly taught, that demons contrive to cure the horrible diseases they had inflicted, by first prescribing remedies, and afterwards ceasing to afflict the patient. This observation is not without foundation. If, for example, demons, by making some alterations (a very slight one would suffice) in the organ of vision, or by placing some external object before it, can deprive men of their sight, what can prevent them from restoring it? Nevertheless, neither reason nor revelation allows them this power. Can a demon open the eyes of the blind? is the language of common sense. This miracle is mentioned both by our Saviour himself as one of the peculiar glories of the Messiah.

The doctrine of real possessions destroys the authority of miracles in general and the use which the Scripture makes of them, as in themselves authentic evidences of a divine mission. If demons can unite themselves to a human body, in the same manner that the soul is united to it by God, so as to govern all the organs of it; if they can deprive men of their sight, and speech, and reason, and then restore them to the use of their faculties; they can rival the glory of the prophets of God. Can there be a more stupendous miracle than that performed upon the herd of swine, in number two thousand, who were all in the same instant seized with madness, and rushed violently into the sea? Now, if demons are able to perform such great miracles as this, and the other here specified, and can also impart the gifts of tongues and prophecy, (a power many ascribe to them), to what other miracles are they not equal? Unless men can shew with certainty how far the power of the tongue extends, and enables us to distinguish—between diabolical and divine miracles, in a very different manner from what they have hitherto done, (which hath chiefly been by calling them by different names), they utterly destroy the authority and true use of miracles, and thereby subvert the foundation on which Christianity is built.

On the other hand, the true explanation of the Gospel demoniacs establishes the certainty, and displays the full glory of the miracles performed upon them. These miracles are always spoken of in the New Testament with singular emphasis and distinction. Scarce are any other miracles more frequently and circumstantially described. It required an extraordinary degree of faith to undertake them, especially when the distemper was violent and inveterate: for in reference to a case of this nature, in which the faith of the apostles had failed them, our Saviour says, *This kind goeth not out, but by prayer and fasting*: "Such difficult miracles are not effected, without such a full dependence upon the Divine power, as is not to be acquired but by continued devotion, such as is not usually accompanied with abstinence." The seventy were filled with exultation and triumph, when they found themselves enabled to cure demoniacs; *Lord, even the demons* (the disorders ascribed to the possession of demons) *are subject to us through thy name* (Luke x., 17). Whenever Christ performed these miracles, the spectators were filled with religious astonishment and awe: *They were amazed, inasmuch that they questioned amongst themselves, saying, What thing is this? What new doctrine is this? with authority commandeth he the unclean spirits, and they obey him*.

In order to understand this language, we must recollect that in our Saviour's time there were, amongst the Jews as well as the Pagans, many imposters who pretended to the power of expelling demons. Some undertook to draw evil spirits out at the nostrils; others engaged only in general to drive them away from the persons whom they possessed. To effect their expulsion, they not only made use of adjurations and charms, but also of strong smells, and other natural remedies. This was a branch of the magic art (which was founded upon the idolatry and superstition of the Heathens); and what credit it

had was supported in part by the efficacy of drugs administered to the patient, but principally by fraud. The proof of the expulsion of demons was, not the perfect and supernatural cure of the demoniac, but the compelling the demon, as he went out, to overturn a statue or vessel of water at some distance. Now, though Christ took no pains to establish the reality of those miracles which he performed upon demoniacs, yet the people, at the sight of them, (deluded as they had hitherto been by the artifices of their countrymen) are filled with the greatest astonishment, and freely acknowledge *It was never so seen in Israel*. What was it that occasioned this extraordinary surprise, and was esteemed quite without example till this time? It could not be the bare expulsion of demons; both because this, abstractedly considered, is no outward and sensible effect; and because it was no more than what they thought their own exorcists were able to accomplish. What then was it, or could it be, that they had never seen before, and could not now see, without the strongest emotions of mind, but the outward and visible miracle, the cure of those terrible disorders which were anciently ascribed to the possession of demons, together with the sovereign manner in which this miracle was performed by Christ, without the use of any natural means?

If you consider more particularly the true nature of this miracle, you will see the reason, both of the great stress laid upon it in the New Testament, and of the powerful effect produced by it upon the spectators. The gospel demoniacs were afflicted with madness, in all its most violent degrees; and their madness was, in some cases, attended with confirmed epilepsies. These terrible maladies (the symptoms of which are obvious to all) affect the mind as well as the body, and were thought by the ancients greatly to exceed the power of natural causes. Under these disorders some were known to have labored for a great number of years, others from their very childhood. Some at the instant of their being cured by Christ suffered the most violent paroxysms of these disorders. To heal such maladies, and restore those afflicted with them to perfect soundness both of body and mind in an instant, without the use of natural remedies, and with the same voice of authority, as when Christ rebuked the winds and the sea, or called forth the dead, is one of the greatest of miracles, not only an outward and sensible, but a most illustrious and astonishing display of the power and presence of God.

No wonder therefore that when Christ healed the epileptic youth, who was *lunatic and sore vexed* with a demon, (that is, both an epileptic and a maniac), we are told, that the spectators were all amazed at the mighty power of God. When he restored the demoniac, who was blind and dumb, to his sight and speech, the people regarded the miracle as the very characteristic of their Messiah, crying out, *is not this the son of David?* language which implies, that to their apprehension, the Messiah himself could not perform a greater miracle. So bright an impression, of the divinity did it bear upon itself, that our Saviour (in answer to his enemies, who from mere malice, disparaged it), instead of entering upon a vindication of it, which was needless; only exposes the absurdity of their censure of it, upon their own principles. Like one who knew what conviction it was fitted to carry to the human mind, he draws the following conclusion from it, *If I cast out demons by the spirit of God, then is the kingdom of God come unto you*: "If I restore demoniacs to their right mind by a divine power, the kingdom of the Messiah is certainly erecting amongst you." Christians need not be ashamed to acknowledge, that they regard the ejection of demons, if truly explained, as one of those august proofs of the mission of their Redeemer, which were designed to recommend him to the reverence of mankind in all ages. It is well adapted to answer the same benevolent end with all the other miracles of the Gospel, which were both performed and recorded, that we might believe that *Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name*. (John xx., 31).

Can you believe that man has an immortal soul, when God's Word teaches us that we must seek for immortality by patient continuance in well doing? Rom. ii. 7. Why seek for it if we have it?



if there be no resurrection, even they which have fallen asleep (died) in Christ have *perished*, and would therefore have no hope excepting in this life. (1 Cor. xv; John v. 29; xi. 23, 24; Heb. xi. 35; John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; 1 Thess. v. 14-16; Luke xx. 37; 2 Cor. i. 9; iv. 14.) God has promised that His people shall be "exalted," not to inherit heaven, but "to inherit the land," as well as to be kings and priests, in the age to come. Instead of going to heaven "the meek" shall inherit the earth, and this is a "blessed" thing according to the Scriptures (see Matt. v. 5; Psa. xxxvii. 9-11); for then "evildoers shall be cut off," and "SHALL NOT BE" (ver. 10), therefore they "shall not see life" (John iii. 36), for they shall be consumed into smoke (ver. 20) but the meek "shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace," and consequently will be in a "blessed" state. We are told plainly in the Scriptures that "the righteous shall be recompensed IN THE EARTH: much more the wicked and the sinner." (Proverbs xi. 31.) Another scriptural reason against the idea that the righteous go to heaven is that they "shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever" (Read Psa. 37). The writer of the Proverbs says, "The righteous shall NEVER BE REMOVED; but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth." (Prov. x. 30). How then can the righteous go to heaven? They do not go to heaven, but they inherit the "kingdom of heaven," or heavenly kingdom, which will be set up when Christ comes, and eventually it will fill the whole earth "under heaven," but not in heaven.—Matt. v. 3, 10; viii. 11, 12; xvi. 43; Dan. chapters 2 and 7; Zech. ix. 10. This kingdom is to be "an everlasting kingdom and all dominions shall serve and obey Him." Dan. vii. 27. The foregoing is in harmony with Mr. Kellogg's scriptural sermon, but although these things are prominently set forth in the Scriptures they are scarcely ever preached by the clergy; accordingly when we read Mr. Kellogg's sermon we likened it to the oasis in the desert. But we are glad to see that even occasionally a clergyman is bold enough to present these glorious truths, in order that more may learn to "love" the Lord's "appearing," instead of to dread it, as the great mass of popular church people do; which shows that they are not in the attitude exhibited by Paul, as in the following:—"I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept THE FAITH: henceforth there is LAID UP for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day (mentioned in verse 1—the day of Christ's appearing); and not only to me, but also to all them who have loved His appearing. Read 2 Tim. iv. 1-8. If we do not love the appearing of our Lord how can we expect the crown when he comes? And why should Paul's crown be "laid up" until the coming of Christ if he expected to go to heaven at death? Apparently his crown has now been laid up 1800 years; but we think it will not remain "laid up" many years longer according to the signs of the times.

If the reader wishes to learn more about "the faith once for all delivered to the saints" let him or her, as the case may be, send fifty cents to the office of this paper and in return we will send vols. 1 and 2 complete (24 numbers) of THE GOOD NEWS, in which will be found a large amount of matter on the different subjects touched upon herein, besides many others of great interest to the seeker after truth. We will send the papers free to any not able to send the price.—EDITOR.]

TEXT.—"Watch, therefore: for ye know neither the day nor the hour when the Son of Man cometh."—Matthew, xxiv. 42; xxv. 13.

On one principle of interpretation we shall be able to agree. It is this: that in all cases the context and subject of discourse are to be allowed decisive force in determining in any passage of Scripture what any word or phrase may mean. The question ever is, not what may, or might, or could, this word or phrase be understood to mean, but what, in the light of the context, does this word or phrase mean in this particular place? The principle needs to be borne in mind in approaching these words of our Lord. The question is not whether the phrase "the coming of the Son of Man" may conceivably be applied to death, or the destruction of Jerusalem, or any spiritual or providential intervention of the Lord, but how does the context require us to understand this phrase in this particular connection?

Grant, if you like, that there are many different "comings" of the Son of Man: we want to know what is that particular "coming" of which the Lord speaks in this place, and for which He commands His disciples to watch. Till we know that we cannot obey Him.

Evidently it must be that coming of which the disciples had asked Him, saying, "Master, what shall be the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the age?" The text is, in part, the answer to this question, and the "coming" in the answer must be the coming referred to in the question. This settles it, you must see, once for all, that the words cannot have the slightest reference to death. They are often so applied; but without the smallest warrant from the context. For when the disciples asked the Master, "What shall be the sign of Thy coming?" did they mean to ask what the signs of a man's dying? The question answers itself. I repeat it then; that to apply this text to death, as is often done, is to use it in a sense for which there is not the least justification in the whole Olivet discourse; and is to substitute for a command actually given by our Saviour another quite different command which He never gave at all.

Is then the coming of which He speaks the destruction of Jerusalem? So many have imagined, but neither will this opinion stand a careful examination of the context. It is indeed true that the Lord did speak in this discourse, and very fully, of a coming destruction of Jerusalem, and of a great tribulation upon Jerusalem, and that this was to be the beginning of the end, and the beginning of the end of the Jews among all nations, and the treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled. (Luke xxi. 20-24.) It is none the less impossible to understand the coming of the Son of Man of which He then speaks—Matt. xxiv. 30, Luke xxi. 27—and to which He refers in the injunction of the text, of that destruction of the Holy City. Do you ask me why? I answer, for the simple reason that, according to all the evangelists, Jesus expressly said that this "coming" should be "after" the Jewish tribulation. For I take it to be self-evident that when, of two events named, one is said to take place after the other, they cannot be one and the same event. The "coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven," of which we read in verse 30, cannot, therefore, be the destruction of Jerusalem, which, as we win, in the text, with reference to that coming, He changes us to "watch," because we know not when it shall be, are forbidden to apply it to that event. We may go further and say, with the utmost confidence, that the coming spoken of in the text cannot refer to anything that has taken place from that day to this. For the evangelist Luke (xli. 23, 24) describes the predicted "tribulation" as continuing in the scattering of the Jews among all nations, and the subjection for a long time of Jerusalem to Gentile power. No one needs to be told that, as a matter of fact, that tribulation on the Jews is in force still to-day. It is evidently lightning, but is not yet quite ended. It is plain, then, that the coming which was to take place "after" the tribulation is still in the future. Hence, when our Lord says, "Watch, for ye know not the day or the hour when the Son of Man cometh," He is warning us with regard to something which is yet for all men in the future. What then can the coming be, so certain to occur, so uncertain as to time, for which He commands us to watch? If not death, if not the destruction of Jerusalem, what can the predicted coming be but that final, glorious, visible personal coming of the Lord Jesus, standing thus at the head of the Christian ages, and calling aloud to His Church as she journeys onward through the darkening centuries, bids her continually to watch. And we learn from Mark, that in order that no disciple of Christ in any coming generation might deem himself absolved from this very solemn charge, He added these words to His disciples who first received the command:—"And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch!"

Let no one of you imagine that in this the preacher is propounding some theological fancy peculiar to himself. On the contrary, without fear of contradiction I affirm this to be the professed though much-neglected faith of Christendom. So plain is the Saviour's teaching as to His second advent, and so manifest the duty which is laid upon us in the text, that our own Confession of Faith in chap. xvi. has devoted a whole section to it, in which we have these words:—"As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, . . . so will He have that day unknown to men, that they may be always watchful, because they know not what hour their Lord will come."

The meaning of these words in the Confession, which was a Presbyterian's profession to receive as a true exhibit of the teaching of Holy Scripture, has been put with admirable clearness by the late Rev. Pro. A. A. Holgo, D.D., of Princeton, N.J., in his "Commentary on the Westminster Confession," where he says:—"This section teaches . . . that the designed effect of the attitude of uncertainty with regard to the time of the second advent . . . in which the saints are placed, is that they should regard it as always immediately impending."

It is then for the future, second, glorious, personal coming of Jesus Christ that the text commands us to watch. We may take that as certain. In further exposition and application of the words, I shall endeavour to show you, first, what is included in the idea of watching, and secondly, what are some of the leading motives by which our Lord has enforced His command.

I.—First then, what is it to "watch" for the second coming of the Lord? I answer, that watching always includes three things: Expectation, Vigilance, and Preparation. All three are essential; leave out any one of these, and a man is not obeying the command of the text.

1.—The first element in watching is expectation.

So, also, to watch for the Lord Jesus from Heaven is to expect the Lord Jesus from Heaven. He is about to come, but we do not expect him to be absent always. We look for His return. This, accordingly, is said to have been the attitude of the primitive believers. Thus Paul describes himself and the other primitive believers as men whose citizenship was in Heaven, "from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change the bodies of our humiliation into the likeness of His own body of glory."

So in 1 Thess. i. 9, 10, we are told that the heathen neighbors of the Thessalonian Christians described them as having two peculiarities; they had "turned to God from idols," and they were "waiting for the Son of God from Heaven, even Jesus." This their expectation that that crucified Jew, Jesus the Nazarene, would come in glory in the clouds of Heaven, was such a prominent thing with them that it attracted universal attention. Let me ask you in passing whether you think that an intelligent heathen coming to Toronto, or any other Christian town, if asked to describe Christians in general by the two leading characteristics which most attracted his attention, would be likely to mention as one of these that they were people differing from others in this, that they were all looking for the Lord Jesus from Heaven? Or might he not attend many a church for a long time, and mingle with many professed believers for years, and never once hear the subject mentioned? Answer this question at your leisure for yourselves, and draw your own conclusions. Meantime, let me call your attention to the words in the Epistle to Titus, ii. 14, wherein Paul says that the "grace of God which hath appeared to all men bringing salvation," teaching "that we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world"—and with this many Christians stop! But Paul did not stop with this; he continued:—"The grace of God which bringeth salvation . . . teacheth us that we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, even the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ." But I need not multiply proofs. It will be granted by all, that, according to the Scriptures, the primitive Church obeyed the command of the text by living in the constant expectation of the Lord Jesus from Heaven. This expectation was plainly included in their conception of watching.

Thus Prof. Fisher, of Yale College (not a premillennialist, in his account of primitive faith and doctrine, says of the Apostles:—"Their yearning for their absent Lord mingled itself with the conviction that the Saviour's work would be incomplete until there should be a manifestation of His power in connection with it. Every hour's delay in His coming was a painful postponement of a wish that pined for its fulfillment. . . . This expectation is expressed by all the Apostles in terms which admit of no other interpretation. To put any other construction on these passages, as if the coming to which they refer were anything else than the Second Advent, would be to introduce a dangerous license in interpretation, and one which might be employed to subvert the principal doctrines of the Christian system." The same doctrine is expressed in most of the Fathers of the second century.

To the same effect is the testimony of Gibbon and all the historians of the primitive Church. The believers of that time were eminently a people who were distinguished from all others by their avowed and earnest expectation of the Lord Jesus from Heaven. That was the way in which they understood the Saviour's command as given in the text. In this we are called to imitate them.

2. But although expectation is essential to watching, yet, if that be all, there is no watching. It is evident that I may be expecting a friend, and yet not be watching for that friend. If, for example, my friend has gone to Europe and has told me that he will return, but not under a year, I shall certainly expect his return, but till that time is up I shall not be watching for him. Evidently, watching is more than mere expectation. It includes also vigilance. By vigilance is meant a careful looking for and scrutiny of what signs there may be of the near approach of him for whom I watch. The sentinel on outpost duty watches, not merely by a general expectation of the approach of the enemy, but by a careful looking for and scrutiny of whatever sign he may see or hear, or think he sees or hears, of the enemy's approach. You watch for the coming of your absent friend, by listening intently for every sound on the pavement, every sound of voices on the street, every token of the near appearing of his face. Hence it is plain that vigilance implies a belief not only that the person for whom we watch will come some time, but that he may come soon. Do not forget this. There may thus be expectation without vigilance; but there can be no watching without vigilance. The virgins in the parable were all of them, wise and foolish, expecting the bridegroom; else they had not been in the marriage procession; but they failed none the less in watching. Thrown off their guard by the bridegroom's unexpected delay, they all, wise and foolish, fell asleep, and thus while they had not ceased to expect that he would come some time, they ceased to be vigilant, and therewith ceased to watch. It is plain, if this be so, that if we will obey the command of our Lord to watch for His second coming, we must not assume to fix in our minds the time of His appearing. This is very often done. It is done in two ways. There are those who fix a time in the distant future; there are others who fix a time in the distant future. Some say the Lord will come in 1888, or 1897, or some other near date. Others say

"The Bible pointedly teaches that, instead of the saints going to heaven, Jesus comes to the saints on earth, and purports that those of them who have 'fallen asleep,' and rewards them here, and they reign with Him on the earth, over the nations. In waiting for Christ they wait for the Kingdom of God. See Luke xxiii. 51; Matt. xxv. 34; Rev. xx. 4, 5; Dan. vii. 13-27; Rev. ii. 26, 27; xxii. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 13-17; 1 Cor. xv. 20-28. No man hath ascended into heaven. John iii. 13; xiii. 33; xiv. 2; Acts ii. 29-34.—Ed. GOOD NEWS.

that it is certain that the Lord cannot come in our day at all; that, in fact, it may be assumed as certain that He will not come for a long time. But these are just as much in the wrong as the others, and like them are acting in direct contravention of our Lord's plain words, that not even the angels of God know the time of His coming. If not they, how are the commentators and the theologians to know? If the angels do not know, how are the commentators to know? It is just in this way that multitudes of Christian people put themselves in a mental position in which it has become impossible for them to obey this command of our Lord to watch.

In opposition to all such theories, whether they fix the time of the advent either in the near or the distant future, stand unaltered our Saviour's very solemn words, "Ye know not when the Master of the house cometh; at even or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning. What I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch."

As therefore this command to watch for the Lord's Second Advent requires us to be vigilant for His coming as well as to expect Him, it is plain that it requires us to regard His advent as a continual possibility. Some of you may perhaps be saying that you cannot do this because of many things which you think must take place before the Lord can come. In other words, you have a theory of prophetic interpretation, more or less definite, and according to that theory the Lord cannot come in our day. The answer to this very common objection is very simple, namely, duty first, theory afterward. The Lord has not commanded you to have a theory of prophetic interpretation; but He has commanded you to watch for His appearing, and to express ground that you do not know but, and may come "in the first watch." It is a good thing to have a theory, if a true one; but it is better yet and safer to obey the Lord. And if you have a theory of prophetic interpretation, let it hinder you from maintaining the attitude of expectant vigilance toward the Lord's coming which is here enjoined. It will at least be prudent to inquire whether we may not be misunderstanding the Scripture. These words, then, make it our duty, believing that the Lord may very possibly come in our generation, to be ever looking out for any signs that may be taken, the Lord has plainly told us. He said that when we should see certain things coming to pass, we might "know" that He was near, even at the doors." (See v. 33 and parallels). And, it may be added, He also taught that although this was true, yet the most of men would never notice the signs, or else would misinterpret them; for He said that the day would come "as a thief in the night," and that it would be "as the thief in the night" (Luke xxi. 35). But He said that there would be signs for him who would heed them. Among these He named, for example, the universal preaching of the Gospel. He said, in so many words, when this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be "preached in all the world for a witness among all nations, then shall the end of the world come." "Ye, therefore, be on the watch, for ye know not the day of the Lord's coming." He described also the social condition of that period as a time when there should be "on earth distress of nations with perplexity; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." And Peter described the religious condition of that time in saying that "many should be found denying that the Lord would ever come at all, and the groans of the laws of nature were uniform, and so on."

"In the last days shall come scoffers, saying, where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." (2 Peter iii. 4). But this will suffice. The command teaches that we are to be looking out for the appearing of any such signs as these, lest, coming suddenly, the Master find us sleeping.

But in reply to this we are often pointed to the disappointments of Christians in this matter. Men, we are told, have often thought that they discerned the signs, and have thought the Lord was near, and yet He has not come. And with this multitude think they have sufficiently excused themselves from obeying the Lord's command. But what should we think of reasoning like this in earthly affairs? What, for instance, would you think of the sentinel who on a perilous picket duty, because he could not tell with certainty when the rustling of the leaf or the distant tramp of horsemen, betokened the enemy's approach, because he had often misinterpreted such facts and been alarmed for nothing, should therefore excuse himself from any further attention to such things and suffer all such signs to go unheeded? Would you like to feel that your life was in the hands of such a soldier?

Or what, at sea, would you think if, with the angry clouds gathering around, the sea and the waves roaring, the commander should refuse even to pay attention to these things, on the ground that often he had misinterpreted and thought a storm coming when it was not? Would you like to be at sea with a commander of that kind? And shall we not more wisely, is our conduct more excusable, if being warned that Jesus Christ is certainly returning, we are coming to be as the lightning in its suddenness, bringing glory to the ready judgment to the unready, charged too by Himself to keep a vigilant outlook for Him; yet, because we are not made infallible, take no heed to signs which he has told us, shall as surely go before His coming as the cloud goes before the storm, the dawn before the day, the light before the sun? Is this wise? God forbid! Enough let it be for us that our Lord has bidden us be vigilant; He knows better far than we where in our wisdom lies. Let it not be that any of us for our unwatchfulness should have to hear from Christ at last that sad reproof to some of old: "How was it that ye did not discern the signs of the times?"

But while expectation and vigilance are essential elements in that watching which the text enjoins, they are not the whole of it. It is implied also that we shall keep ourselves in readiness

for Christ's appearing. The betrothed maiden who expects day by day her affianced one to claim her as his bride, does not satisfy herself with mere expectation or with listening for his coming. She keeps herself in readiness to give him a suitable welcome. So with the coming of the Heavenly Bridegroom. A watching believer will be a ready believer. Thus it is quite possible that one may be expecting the Lord's coming and be a great student of prophecy, and of the signs of the times, and yet not be obeying this command.

With all his expectation of the Bridegroom and his concern to be found in the company of those who go out to meet Him, a man may very possibly forget to take oil in his vessel with his lamp. Let us remember this. I need not remind you in what this readiness for Christ's coming consists. It begins with faith and repentance; it is expressed in holiness and unworldliness of life, a life such as shall bear a continuous witness to the world that we do really believe in Christ's atoning death, His glorious resurrection, and imminent appearing as earth's rightful King. Faith, repentance, holy living—herein is the only preparation." Let us not deceive ourselves. No half preparation is consistent with the attitude of a soul watching for the Saviour's coming. It will not be found enough to be in the virgin company, to be enrolled as church members in good and regular standing. Remember that half of that virgin company in the parable were shut out from the marriage supper.

Nay, we may say more. As has been truly remarked, "Even the best prepared were not quite ready." For observe, it is said, that suddenly awakened by the cry that the bridegroom was at hand, "all those virgins," not the foolish only, but the wise as well, "arose and trimmed their lamps." From this it appears that the lamps of even the wise, because they had neglected to watch, had begun to burn dimly and needed trimming. Thus there may be a sincere profession where there is not yet full readiness to meet Christ. Let us lay it to heart that if we are indeed waiting for the Son of God from Heaven, it will not do to rest easy with a barely credible profession. It will not prove enough to have lamps of profession; not enough that these lamps even be burning in a doubtful, flickering fashion. We must take heed that we have, so to speak, a superabundance of the oil of divine grace, adequate to the last degree of delay by which our faith may be tested. We must also see to it that our lamps of profession are kept trimmed, so that they shall not only burn, but burn brightly. Let us not forget our Saviour's solemn charge concerning His advent, "Take heed to yourselves lest at anytime your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness—that may not touch us, but the next words touch us all—"overcharged with cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." Ah! this indeed warns us all! How many our cares! and how they tend to preoccupy the mind so as to kill out a watchful spirit and make us forget that "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh!" Business cares, family cares, household and domestic cares and perplexities, for ourselves, for our houses, for our children—cares all of this life! "Take heed," warns our Saviour, "lest your hearts be overcharged with these cares so that ye shall forget to watch, and the day which shall come as a snare shall come upon you unawares."

II. In closing I will now advert briefly to the motives by which our Lord has enforced this so neglected command.

1. Of these the first and most frequently insisted on is that which is mentioned in the text, the uncertainty of the time. "Ye know not the day or the hour when the Son of Man cometh." These words have never yet been taken back. They stand, for all believers in all ages, a most impressive and solemn warning to continued watchfulness—not for death, as we have clearly seen, but for that second coming of the Lord which, for all His believing people, shall END DEATH IN RESURRECTION. When it shall be we know not. It may be in the first watch, for the Saviour has said so; it may not be till later. The Church may have long years of weary waiting yet before her,

\*We must also be baptised into Christ in order to become heirs of the Kingdom or of what was promised through Abraham and his seed. Gal. iii; Gen. xii. 1-3; xiii. 14-17; Luke i. 70-74; John iii. 5.—Ed. G. N.



or her redemption may be just at hand. So far from its being certain that Christ will not come for centuries, it is quite possible according to the Scriptures, that, for anything any man really knows to the contrary, many of us may live to witness, without dying, the glorious appearing.

What a motive this for watchfulness! for liveliest expectation, for the most wakeful vigilance, for the most thorough preparation! How can we be excused if we neglect it!

2. Another motive to watchfulness which our Lord has given us is found in His warning that when at last He does come, that coming will be to the most of men a great surprise. It will be a surprise not only to avowed worldlings and unbelievers, but, He tells us, also to the Church. All the parables and illustrations which he uses regarding His coming set this forth. It was while the servant was saying, "My Lord delayeth His coming!" that the Master of the house came. It was while "all the virgins," wise, mark, as well as foolish, were soundly sleeping, that the startling cry was heard, "Behold the bridegroom cometh! Go ye out to meet Him!" It is while men shall be saying, "Peace and safety," Paul declares that sudden destruction shall come upon them, and they shall not escape. The day of the coming of the Son of Man shall be, Christ said, "as the days of Noah." Noah had been preaching for several hundred years, and for a hundred and twenty years had been telling of the coming flood. But they did not believe him; they probably thought the old man (fanatical or daft). They went on with their worldly living just the same, "eating and drinking, and marrying and giving in marriage, and knew not till the flood came and swept them all away." "So," adds the Saviour, "shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed."

Hence it appears that one of the most common reasons given by Christians for declining to pay attention to this truth and duty, namely, that the most of people do not believe in it, and understand the Scriptures differently, ought to be a motive to just the opposite conclusion. For in this fact we may see before our eyes, that even in the Church, people have come to think and talk and live just as our Saviour said they would be thinking and living when He should come. In the first days of the Church, when the virgin company had not yet gone to sleep, and the expectation of the advent was quick and lively, this prediction must have seemed very hard to believe. But we see it fulfilled! What an argument this should be for increased watchfulness! for seeking to be in this respect as much unlike the most of professing Christians as possible!

3. It is another motive to obedience to this command, which our Lord and His Apostles have set before us, that it will prove to many a very evil and disastrous thing not to be found watching for the Lord. The absence of this spirit is always represented as one of the dark features in the condition of the Church as she nears the time of the advent. It is against this particular form of spiritual declension, as one to which even true Christians, even "wise virgins," by reason of the Lord's delay, would be peculiarly exposed, and which ever tends to bring in its train all manner of easy-going religion and absorbing worldliness, that the most solemn and repeated warnings of the Lord are given.

I hardly need to remind you of the many passages already quoted which so clearly teach this. By their unwatchfulness, their sleeping when they might have been getting needed oil, half the virgin company are represented by our Lord as excluded from the marriage supper; while the lamps, even of those who entered in while they slept, had become so encrusted that they burnt dimly and needed trimming before they could feel ready to meet the bridegroom. Let us all remember this and be warned betimes!

4. On the other hand we may find a very different and most inspiring motive to obedience in the fact that our Lord has expressly promised to show

\*The Bible does not teach, as do the clergy, that we should prepare for death, but that we should prepare for the coming of the Lord, or, in other words, for the life to come—or the world (age) to come. If we are prepared for this we will receive something we do not now possess, namely immortality—eternal life. Mark x., 29, 30; Rom. ii., 6, 7; 1 Cor. xv., 51-54.—Ed. G. N.

peculiar and distinguishing grace to those of His disciples whom when He comes He shall find watching. For it is written that He said, Luke xiii., 37:—"Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when He cometh shall find watching; verily, I say unto you, that He shall gird Himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if He shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants." You will ask what this means. I reply, I do not know in what this special grace thus figuratively set forth may prove to consist; but the words do certainly assure us that a special blessing will be given by the Lord when He comes to those disciples who had obeyed His command to watch. Less than that the words cannot teach. Shall we not all strive to attain a participation in that grace? But I will not say more, though much might be added. Let us take heed to this neglected command of Christ. As the saintly Rutherford said, "Persuade yourselves, the King is coming! Read His letter sent afore Him—'Behold I come quickly!'"

Wait with the wearied night watch! Watch for the breaking of the Eastern sky! The Lord said that He would come in "a little while." Is it not certain that that of little while must be already gone? If Paul could even in his day say, "Now is your salvation nearer than when ye first believed," how much more we, now that almost two thousand years have gone!

Look about you! Are there no significant signs which should awaken every one of us to a trimming of lamps and closest vigilance? The Gospel "shall be preached for a witness among all nations; then shall the end come!" Have those words no special note of warning in this missionary century? The Church was to be unexpected; men should be looking forward to years of peace and safety. How is it with that sign? Can we discern it? True, the cry of warning is heard, and ever more and more. A McChesney, the Bonars, a Spurgeon, and Alford, a Godet, a great number of learned and devout men on the Continent of Europe, and a Moody and a great company of evangelists with him, are raising anew the cry, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh!" Is there nothing in all this to set us to thinking?

Verily we, in this generation, may say, with a greater emphasis than ever before, "Yet a little while and He that shall come will come and will not tarry." And when He does come—then—oh, the startled waking of many! oh, the hurried trimming of many a dimly burning lamp of Christian profession! oh, the anxious and distressful inquiry of multitudes after that oil of grace which, all too late for the marriage supper of the Lamb, they now find they lack!

May the Lord direct every one of us into the patient waiting and watching for Christ!

\*"Behold I come quickly and my reward is with me to give every man."—Rev. xxi., 12. Hence we do not go to heaven to be rewarded. We "wait" here for the coming of the Lord.—Ed. G. N.

†The end of this age or cosmos.—Ed. G. N.

### The Kingdom of God.

The Kingdom of God is the grand theme of the gospel. It is that into which Christians hope to obtain an entrance. It is that for which Christ has taught us to pray, "Thy kingdom come." It is that which we are exhorted to seek for in connection with the righteousness of God: "seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

The Kingdom of God was set up when Israel came up from Egypt through the wilderness and entered into the promised land. Listen to the Lord's testimony in regard to setting up this kingdom:

"I swore unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee saith the Lord, and thou becamest Mine. Then washed I thee with water; yea, I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil. I clothed thee also with brodered work, and shod thee with badger's skin, and girded thee about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk. I decked thee also with ornaments, and I put bracelets upon thy hands, and a chain on thy neck. And I put a jewel on thy forehead, and earrings in thine ears, and a beautiful crown upon thy head.

Thus wast thou decked with gold and silver; and thy raiment was of fine linen, and silk and brodered work; thou didst eat fine flour, and honey and oil: and thou wast exceeding beautiful, and thou didst prosper into a kingdom. And thy renown went forth among the heathen for thy beauty: for it was perfect through My comeliness, which I had put upon thee, saith the Lord God." (Ezek. xvi., 8-14).

This passage tells the whole story. The Lord delivered the people from Egypt, led them through the wilderness, gave them a law, entered into a covenant with them, and they became His people, and He their God. They were then married to the Lord, and took possession of their territory according to the terms of the covenant which they had entered into with Him, which was a conditional lease. As long as they fulfilled the terms of the covenant they were to remain in the land, with certain privileges and blessings, granted to them by the owner.

But in the accomplishment of all this they had "prospered into a kingdom." The question which now arises is, Whose kingdom was this? The land belonged to the Lord. Thus He says: "The land shall not be sold forever; for the land is Mine." (Lev. xxv., 23). The Lord took the people out of Egypt, and led them through the wilderness. He drove out the nations before them and gave them cities and villages, and a land flowing with milk and honey, and became their King. A novice ought to be able to tell whose kingdom this was. A King so wealthy, wise and powerful as to do all this for a people, would certainly claim the kingdom as His Own.

But as to this we are not left in doubt. It is not only perfectly reasonable to call this the Lord's Kingdom, but the Bible furnishes us with positive proof that it was His, and that it was so recognized by the children of Israel themselves.

When the Israelites, for their sins, were sold into the hand of the Midianites and were sorely oppressed, so that they made dens and caves and strongholds, some of which are to be found in the mountains to this day, the Lord raised up Gideon to deliver them. And when they were so wonderfully delivered "the men of Israel" said unto Gideon, "rule thou over us, both thou, and thy son, and thy son's son also: for thou hast delivered us from the hand of the Midianites. And Gideon said unto them, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: the Lord shall rule over you." (Judges viii., 22, 23).

Gideon knew who the real Ruler was; and Who had delivered Israel. He would not take the glory to himself, nor allow the people to make him king. But he did do a foolish thing after all, when he made an "ephod" of the seventeen hundred shekels of gold which the people had taken from Midian, the Ishmaelites, and put it in his own city, which caused Israel to worship it. O the weakness of sinful human nature! Gideon, as good and great as he was, and as worthy of being used and honored of God as he was, could not resist the temptation to do something to perpetuate his name. He knew that God was the Ruler of the nation, but still felt that he himself was of more consequence than he really was. What he did "became a snare unto Gideon and to his house," notwithstanding the country had quietness for forty years while he judged Israel.

But we will pass on to Samuel. The elders of Israel said to Samuel, "Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations." This displeased Samuel, because he thought the people were slighting him; but "the Lord said unto Samuel, Harken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them." (1 Sam. viii., 5-7).

The thing was done, and Saul was made king. In pointing out to Israel their sins, the Lord by the prophet Hosea, in forcible language, refers to this event. He says, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in Me is thine help. I will be thy King: where is any other that may save thee in all thy cities; and thy judges of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I gave thee a king in Mine anger, and took him away in My wrath." (Hosea xiii., 9-11).

Thus while God their real King granted the nation of Israel a king like the nations around them, He did not deliver up to him the supreme rulership but retained the right to take down from the throne of His own kingdom, the king whom He had anointed and placed there, and set up another whomsoever He would. David was next chosen and anointed. All the kings who sat upon the throne of the kingdom over Israel were anointed by God, because they were to sit upon the throne of His kingdom to rule for Him.

But when Saul was made king, Samuel undertook to show the people the enormity of the crime they had committed in asking for a king, and in his unambiguous language, he uses this unambiguous language, which any child may understand: "And when ye saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came against you, ye said unto us; when the Lord your God was your King. Now therefore behold the king whom ye have chosen, and whom ye have desired; and, behold, the Lord hath set a king over you." (1 Sam. xii., 12, 13).

This is definite; who can dispute such testimony? The Lord was the King of the Kingdom of Israel. But we will look again. Hear the Prophet David: "The Lord God of Israel chose me before all the house of my father to be king over Israel forever; for He hath chosen Judah to be the ruler; and of the house of Judah, the house of my father; and among the sons of my father He liked me to make me king over all Israel; and of all my sons, (for the Lord hath given me many sons), He hath chosen Solomon my son, to sit upon the throne of the Kingdom of the Lord over Israel." (1 Chron. xxviii., 4, 5).

If the Bible is a sure guide we are most certainly following the track of truth in regard to the Kingdom of God. It was nothing more nor less than the Kingdom of Israel, with God for its Supreme Ruler, and which was also the Kingdom of David. But we read again: "Then Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of his father David, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him." (1 Chron. xxi., 23). When the queen of Sheba made Solomon a visit, she said to him, "Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee to set thee on His throne, to be king for the Lord thy God." (2 Chron. ix., 8).

After the kingdom was divided, and when Abijah, the great grandson of David, was sitting upon the throne of the Lord, he said to Jeroboam, king of the ten tribes, who was making war with him, "Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons by a covenant of salt? . . . And now ye think to withstand the Kingdom of the Lord in the hand of the sons of David. . . . And, behold, God Himself is with us for our Captain and His priests with sounding trumpets to cry alarm against you. O children of Israel, fight ye not against the Lord God of your fathers; for ye shall not prosper." (2 Chron. xiii., 5, 8, 12). And they did not prosper, for there were slain of the ten tribes "five hundred thousand chosen men."

Of what use can the Bible be to us, if such Scriptural facts can not be relied upon? This was God's Kingdom. It can not be successfully contradicted. The Lord undertook to establish a kingdom. Was he defeated? Must it turn out like the effort of Jefferson Davis to establish a southern confederacy? Or has everything thus far in its history been but preliminary steps towards the accomplishment of His great purpose concerning this kingdom? The latter is true.

The Kingdom of Israel is the Kingdom of God! There is no other mentioned in the Bible! There is no other in God's plan of salvation! The Kingdom of God is yet to be restored to Israel. (Acts i., 6, 7). Whoever of the human family shall see the Kingdom of God will see the Kingdom of Israel. Whoever will have an entrance ministered unto them "abundantly into the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," will find an entrance into the Kingdom of Israel, and the kingdom of David. The restoration of Israel to their own land, between the river of Egypt and the great river Euphrates, will be the restoration of the Kingdom of God.

When it can be said that the Kingdom of God is at hand, it can be said

that the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel to their own land is at hand, for the two events are one and the same thing. The tribes can not be restored without setting up the Kingdom; and the Kingdom cannot be set up without the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel to their own land.—Selected.

[The foregoing is without doubt, in harmony with the teaching of the Word of God throughout, and gives a bird's-eye view of the good news of God's plan of salvation. We read, "Salvation is of the Jews." (John iv., 22). It is of the Jews through Jesus, one of that race, who is the anointed "King of the Jews."—Acts iv., 12, 25-27; Matt. ii., 2; xxvii., 37. "He came to his own (people, the Jews) and they that were his own received him not (as a nation). But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on His name." John i., 11, 12, R. V. But the time will come when "they shall look on Him whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son." Zech. xii., 10, R. V.; John xix., 37; Rev. i., 7. "He is not ashamed to call them brethren," (Heb. ii., 11); and the time will come when they "shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." Matt. xxiii., 39. Jesus is also both "Lord and Christ," (the Anointed One or Messiah.) Rev. xi., 15; Mark xv., 32. The word Christ simply means anointed. The Jewish kings were always anointed before occupying the throne, and the throne of Israel was the throne of the Lord. Proof:—1 Chron. xxviii., 4, 5; xxix., 23. The early disciples and apostles knew well that Jesus was the Messiah and heir to David's throne, and consequently asked Jesus, after His resurrection, if He would "at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Acts i., 6; Luke i., 32, 33. We are told in the Scriptures that God raised up Christ (from the dead) to sit on David's throne (Acts ii., 30), for His "right it is." Ezek. xxi., 25-27. And He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His Kingdom there shall be NO END. Luke i., 33. But at present Jesus sits with God on His throne. Rev. iii., 21. "Whom (Christ) the heavens must receive UNTIL the times of restitution of all things, whereof God spake by the mouth of His holy prophets which have been since the world began." Acts iii., 21, R. V. "In the regeneration (at the time of restoration) the Son of man shall sit on the throne of His glory."—His own throne (Matt. xix., 28), the throne of His father David; which, as we have seen, is also the throne of the Lord."—See Rev. iii., 21. Christ said "I will come again," (John xiv., 3), and the angels said, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner (bodily) as ye have seen him go into heaven," (Acts i., 11); and his second appearing will be in connection with the setting up of his kingdom, for which he told His disciples to pray.—Thy kingdom come. II. Tim. iv., 1. When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with Him, THEN shall He sit on the throne of His glory. Matt. xxv., 31. And "when Christ, who is OUR LIFE, shall appear, THEN, (not before) shall we also appear with Him in glory," (Col. iii., 4).—I. e., when Christ comes back again to the earth, to sit in the throne of His glory, we shall at that time also appear with Him and share in His glory. From this it is evident we do not go to glory when we die. Neither do we come from heaven, but we come from our graves. See I. Thess. iv., 13-18; John vi., 40. If we are in Christ we are "joint heirs" with Him of the earth, and shall reign with Him "over the nations." See Gal. iii.; Rom. iv., 13-17; Rev. iii., 21; v., 9, 10; ii., 25-27; Matt. xxv., 31-34; xiii., 38-43. As David's throne was on earth, so must Christ's kingdom be established on earth when he comes again. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High; whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him." Dan. vii., 27; ii., 44. "The meek shall then inherit the earth," and dwell therein for ever, for "the righteous shall never be removed" from the earth. See Prov. x., 30; Psa. xxxvii.; Matt. v., 5.—If the reader wishes to see a more exhaustive consideration of this subject, send for THE GOOD NEWS, Vol. I.—EDITOR GOOD NEWS.]